The Congregational Quarterly

EDITORIAL

We hope the Bermuda conference will have done something to bring into closer alignment the attitudes as well as the policies of France, Britain and America. We hope it will help to restore a sense of perspective to European critics of recent American policies. The freedom of democracies sometimes leads to foolish speaking, and across three thousand miles of ocean it is not always recognized for what it is. This country has suffered enough in times past from the old game of tail twisting not to know that it is mischievous rather than dangerous. Indeed Americans themselves have often told the world what they thought about the British Empire in terms so plain that they ought to be less sensitive than they occasionally show themselves to be to the foolish utterances of left wing orators. But even the *New York Times* has recently declared its impatience with "the extraordinary babble of bad manners and bad history on the English left."

Let it be remembered across the Atlantic that we were economically exhausted by two wars while the United States was—especially in the second—building up its unprecedented productivity, and that it is not only old ladies who have 'suffered reverses' who are jealous of their independence; and we will remind our tub-thumpers that our economic recovery is largely due to Marshall aid, that America by its military and civil help since the war has saved western Europe from communist domination, that vast humanitarian schemes have been mainly financed from America, that she has welcomed to her Universities large numbers of students from Africa and Asia as well as Europe, that her factories have been open to productivity teams from all over the world.

There are ugly aspects of the American scene, too, which we need not rehearse here, and these become the more prominent because we and all the free world look now to the United States for qualities of leadership which are not to be expressed in dollars. We have been grateful for the dollars, and still are, but dollars will not buy us out of the present predicaments in which we are all involved.

* * *

"Something in Christianity survives the fall of Roman Empires and national monarchies, lives on when Platonism and Aristotelianism go out of fashion, and persists when a whole civilization changes its character." So Professor Butterfield in *Christianity, Diplomacy and War* (Epworth Press, 125 pp., 8s. 6d.) believes it may yet be possible for Christian thinkers to make what may prove to be a decisive contribution towards solving the world's troubles. This is encouragement indeed at a time when many Christians are tempted to withdraw from the horrid confusion of international affairs, "the whole sorry story of power, diplomacy, armaments and war," and to seek refuge in authoritarian systems or in a theology as remote as astronomy from the common life of struggling men. Some historians, indeed, are no less remote, but Professor Butterfield is here concerned with our situation in this present and our immediate future. So whether we agree with all his estimates and suggestions or not, we shall do well to attend to what he says.

* * *

The present threats and dangers, total war, revolution and 'generalized barbarism,' have their sources, he believes, in the war of 1914, but are not the result of the mere fact of the war, but of its protracted and desperate nature. It was the decision to make the conflict 'a war of righteousness' and therefore a war in which no compromise was possible, in which there was no stopping place short of the destruction of one of the protagonists, which not only made the war so dreadful, but finally created a vacuum which the eventual victors could not fill and gave opportunity for the operation of forces which they could not control. This tragic mistake was repeated in the second world war—'the unnecessary war' as Sir Winston Churchill has called it. The very completeness of victory made possible totally unforseen consequences, after the first, the rise of Hitler, and after the second, the expanding communist revolution. So Professor Butterfield draws the conclusion that the question we ought now to ask is, 'In a world where we cannot eliminate war how can we control it, and how can we still maintain an international order?'

* * *

His answer is to contrast the unlimited world wars with their catastrophic consequences with the kind of war that has been fought in Korea, a war for definite, limited ends, a war which when it is over will allow for the resumption of such relations between the contestants as existed before. This discussion is closely argued, and may not carry conviction in all its details, but it makes the

irresistible plea that forgiveness is as essential, if life is to go on, in the relationships between States as between people. And it is Christians who know that forgiveness is only possible among those who believe that we are all sinners before God, that no hearts are so pure and no hands so clean as to appoint themselves the punitive agents of God's righteousness. The temptation to do so is always strong. These enemies—are they not the enemies of God? Is it not because they are God's enemies that they are ours? 'Do I not hate them that hate Thee?' we cry with the Psalmist: 'I hate them with a perfect hatred.' But 'Vengeance is Mine, saith the Lord. I will repay.' There is indeed a war for righteousness in the universe, but as Butterfield says, "it is not fought at the level at which it serves the militant needs of one State against another". We therefore have to do what we can in "this world of half-lights, this grey drab world of the half-righteous."

* * *

No small part of our trouble is that the optimism of the nineteenth century has left its mark upon us. We tend to think that peace is the natural state of mankind, and that someone, our ancestors or God Himself, should have seen to it. In fact peace is a mighty achievement, all too precarious, its creation and maintenance requiring not merely good intentions but 'the artifice of contriving minds.' "The real clue to the civilizing process lies in the development of an international order and the recognition that civilization is a precarious thing, laboriously constructed and requiring much thought even for its simple maintenance. It could never have been developed on the ethics of an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth."

* * *

Butterfield meets the objection that an international order becomes impossible when, as now, two ideological systems exist which regard themselves as mutually exclusive. He answers in part by showing how in the sixteenth century Europe was divided into two supra-national systems, Protestantism and Catholicism, so bitterly opposed to each other that in order to live in the same world men were driven to put themselves outside both and, being driven into some form of toleration and making a virtue of necessity, found that freedom of conscience was not merely a compromise but an end in itself, and that practising it, they had broken through into a new period in the history of civilization.

* * *

It is when Butterfield examines these opposing ideologies that questions arise which he does not answer. Our present dislike of the classless society is, we agree, largely due to its present association with the 'agile agressiveness' of Russian imperialism in its modern dress. But do we not also fear the destruction of that concept of freedom of conscience to which civilization owes so much? The egalitarianism of communism may indeed be a more drastic application of a Christian truth than is yet accepted in the West—in that sense communism may perhaps be described as a Christian heresy—but with it go the submersion of the individual and the minority group, and all the inhumanities of forced labour, indistinguishable from slavery, which are an important element in the Soviet economy—these things are not variants of Christian truth, they are its negation.

* * *

It is at this point that we should have been glad of a closer examination of the 'exploitation' of Asia and Africa by the West, which is mentioned more than once. If it is right, as well as inevitable, that the riches and graces of civilization should be shared, if it is right that the natural resources of the earth should be used, how are these things to be done? The Western imperial powers have a record of capital investment, economic development and colonial administration which needs to be put into perspective. There are stained pages in the record, but it is not all blots! In the context of the capitalist-communist debate this word 'exploitation' needs closer definition and the nature of any alternative should be indicated. Professor Butterfield does less than justice to Protestantism in its conflict with Catholicism and the West in its conflict with Communism. In "this grey, drab world of the half-righteous" some light shines, and it is in the Protestant West that toleration and freedom of conscience have taken root and even produced some flowers. The only freedom Catholicism and Communism recognize is freedom to accept their authority and freedom within it, whereas the only freedom the Protestant West denies is freedom to destroy it from within.

In a short book one must not expect everything to be worked out and Professor Butterfield's main plea is for time, time for the 'imponderables' of Christian civilization to recover from the wars, to accumulate the wisdom, skill and understanding necessary for a new environment, time to establish an international order in which communism may be 'contained' but not outlawed, time for the development of a successor to the Christendom that has been shattered.

* * *

It has always been difficult to understand how European intellectuals are able to work within a system which demands acceptance down to the last detail of philosophical orthodoxy. A book that throws vivid light on this question is *The Captive Mind* by Czeslaw Milosz (Secker and Warburg, pp. xv. 251, 18s.). The author was a young poet in pre-war Poland. He lived through five years of Nazi occupation and after a period as a free-lance writer served in the Polish Foreign service. In 1951 he broke with the régime and sought asylum in France. His book takes us into that strange world inhabited by the intellectuals on the other side of 'the curtain', progressively the victims, disciples and exponents of the 'New Faith', dialectical materialism as interpreted by Lenin and Stalin—"this stupefying and loathsome phenomenon" he now calls it. He describes the stages by which "the mind gives way to compulsion from without" in four psychological studies of eminent Polish writers who finally succumbed and accepted the New Faith and, as he shows us what happened to his friends, we become aware of what has been happening to himself. One realises the restlessness and disillusionment in eastern Europe before the war; the horror and beastliness of the German occupation, which made any kind of 'liberation' acceptable; the reluctance to see the hollowness of what in their desperation they had welcomed. He helps us to see why collaboration seemed to be necessary and right before it came to be seen to be the way of death.

Nevertheless, M. Milosz declares, while the eastern European intellectual looks to the West for something, some sign to give hope for the future, he is revolted by the lack of order which allows artists and poets to starve while "wealthy men not knowing what to do with their money, spend it all on the latest whims of their benighted souls." Fear of the indifference with which the economic system of the West treats its artists and scholars is widespread. They say, "It is better to deal with an intelligent devil than with a good natured idiot . . . who gives nothing and asks nothing." About religion, M. Milosz says that they think Western Christians make no real use of their freedom, and have allowed their religion to become something in the nature of a vestigial custom such as may be found in the folklore of many nations. So the choice which M. Milosz has made is the rejection of an evil rather than the acceptance of a good. This book is really disturbing but it ought to be read. It is brilliantly written and translated.

* * *

In spite of the elaborate precautions in the Government scheme for commercialized television that has been devised, a principle of real importance has been conceded. The trouble is that worth-while

television is so expensive that neither the Government nor the trading interests involved believe that the viewer can be persuaded to pay for what he is being encouraged to demand. So the advertiser is to be allowed to foot the bill. He will, in the end, of course demand his money's worth. In a remarkable article entitled "Advertising: the Institution of Abundance" in the autumn number of the Yale Review, Professor David Potter shows how this kind of thing is working out in America. Advertising, he says, now exerts a social influence comparable with that of school or church. In newspapers and magazines the cycle is fixed and inescapable. Advertising is essential to enable a journal to sell at a price that ensures a large circulation. The contents of a journal must therefore be addressed to the mass mind of a vast public. The best writers must therefore be induced to write for the vast public of potential consumers. Their function is not to deliver a message but to gather and hold the crowd to whom the advertiser wishes to make his appeal. In fact we gather that the writer is now little more than the man who beats the drum outside the circus and shouts 'Walk up, walk up.' Even in this country the process is far advanced among newspapers, but radio has been saved to work out its own salvation. Television will be thrown to the wolves, if the Government cannot be induced to withdraw its scheme.

* * *

These notes in our July number included a tribute to the high regard among Congregationalists everywhere that is held by Dr. Nathaniel Micklem, who recently retired from the Principalship of Mansfield College. We now take the opportunity of offering our congratulations to his father, the head of a distinguished Congregational family. In November last Mr. Nathaniel Micklem, Q.C., celebrated his 100th birthday. He shares with Viscount Cecil of Chelwood the remarkable distinction of having taken silk in the reign of Queen Victoria and after practising as a King's Counsel for more than fifty years resuming his old title under Queen Elizabeth II. In his faraway youth he was President of the Oxford Union, and sat as Liberal member for Watford in the famous Parliament of 1906. For many years he was chairman of the Governors of Mill Hill School and did great service in a field of education calamitously neglected by the Free Churches. (The diversion—we will avoid the word loss—of Free Church boys and girls educated at public schools has gravely weakened the lay leadership of our churches.) We salute a father in Israel whose loyalty and devotion expressed in many ways through many years has brought honour to himself and to Congregationalism.

THE BIBLE AND PERSONAL IMMORTALITY

By T. W. Manson, M.A., D.Litt., D.D., D.Theol., F.B.A.[1]

'And David said to his servants "Is the child dead?" They said, "He is dead". Then David arose from the earth, and washed, and anointed himself, and changed his clothes, and he went into the house of the Lord, and worshipped; he then went to his own house; and when he asked, they set food before him, and he ate. Then his servants said to him, "What is this thing that you have done? You fasted and wept for the child while it was alive; but when the child died you arose and ate food." He said, "While the child was still alive, I fasted and wept, for I said, 'Who knows whether the Lord will be gracious to me, that the child may live?' But now he is dead; why should I fast? Can I bring him back again? I shall go to him, but he will not return to me" '.[2]

'I shall go to him, but he will not return to me'. There you have in a dozen words the ultimate heartbreak of human life. It matters little whether we look upon the dead child, his life ended almost before it has begun; or stand in our vast war cemeteries amid the memorials of men cut down in the prime of their manhood; or watch the slow erosion of the human frame by the flood of years. Always the same question asks itself; when external violence or inner decay has done its work, is there anything left that can say to itself, 'Here I am'? Or is the total truth that the physical constituents that made up the brain and brawn of John Smith have now all entered into other relations, and that episode that we called John Smith is completely finished? Man confronted by the wreckage of what was once his brother most naturally asks himself whether there is any hope either of reconstitution or, failing that, of the salvage of some essential part of the dead man. And man in ancient times was unwilling to contemplate the possibility of total extinction. True, you will find Lucretius saying,

"When we shall be no more, when there shall have come the parting of body and soul, by whose union we are made one, you may know that nothing at all will be able to happen to us, who then

1 The Drew Lecture for 1953/4, delivered at New College, London, 23rd October, 1953. When Principal Cave wrote in September, 1952, inviting me to give the lecture, he mentioned his impending retirement and said it would be the last Drew Lecture over which he would preside as Principal of the College. Death made that impossible; and the lecture, which should have been given under his auspices, must now be offered as a tribute to the memory of a fine scholar and a loyal servant of the Gospel.

2 2 Sam. xii, 19-23 (RSV).

will be no more, or stir our feeling; no, not if earth shall be mingled with sea, and sea with sky.''[3]

But this is a minority opinion. Most people look to some kind of continued existence beyond the grave.

In ancient Egypt 'men looked forward to a happy existence in the Sekhet-hetepet or Fields of Peace, where life was conceived to be practically a continuation of that known on earth, but without its miseries'.[4] The Babylonians had a less alluring picture. For them 'the dead lived in an underground region, which was called Arâlu. It was ruled over by its own gods, the chief of whom were Nergal and his consort Allatu. The region itself was dark and gloomy, and offered an unattractive existence. The Babylonians saw no reason to fear punishment or hope for reward beyond the grave, and had no thought of a resurrection.'[5] The beliefs held in ancient Israel have considerable similarity to the Babylonian. The Hebrew Sheol has much more in common with the Babylonian Arâlu than with the Egyptian Fields of Peace. In order to understand the old Israelite picture of the condition of the dead in the other world it is necessary to have some idea of how the Hebrews thought of a living man in this world; and here I cannot do better than quote Professor Aubrey Johnson.[6]

'In Israelite thought man is conceived of, not so much in dual fashion as ''body'' and ''soul'', but synthetically as a unit of vital power or (in current terminology) a psycho-physical organism. . . . At death, however, the unity of this whole is broken up; the organism as a centre of vital power is destroyed. Nevertheless, this does not mean a man's complete extinction. For some time at least he may live on as an individual (apart from his possible survival within the social unit) in such scattered elements of his personality as the bones, the blood, and the name. Thus death is to be explained in terms of life. It is a weak and indeed . . . the weakest form of life; for it involves a complete scattering of one's vital power. . . . This conception of death as a weak form of life may also be seen in the fact that man is further pictured as living on, a mere shadow of his former self, in company with the *rephaim* in the underworld of Sheol.'

Man alive is a 'unit of vital power': man dead is such a unit that has run down. Sheol is the underground depository of the dead. It is 'the deepest place in the universe, just as heaven is the highest. There is room for many, and he who has got down there never returns'[7]: 'I shall go to him, but he will not return to me.'

[3] *De rerum natura*, III, 838-42 (C. Bailey's translation).
[4] E. F. Sutcliffe, *The Old Testament and the Future Life*, p. 6.
[5] Sutcliffe, *op. cit.* 18.
[6] *The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel.* 88 ff.
[7] J. Pedersen, *Israel I-II*, 460.

Sheol is 'for the most part, a still and silent "land of forgetfulness", which even at its best is but a pale and gloomy reflection of the world of light and life which is Yahweh's special sphere.'[8] We may perhaps illustrate what is meant by the picture of a dump for worn-out motor-cars. They are there. They still exist: rusty, dirty, and battered. They still exist: only they don't go any more. Sheol is like that, a scrap-heap for worn-out human beings. They have not ceased to exist: they have only ceased to possess vital power in any usable quantity. They are totally and permanently incapacitated. This goes with the fact that any weakness or incapacity during life can be regarded, and is regarded, as a form of death; and recovery from such a weakness can be treated as restoration to life.[9] The underlying conviction in all this way of thinking is that real life is the kind of life that is lived in the world as we know it; that it consists in effort and achievement, in acquisition and enjoyment, in loving one's friend and hating one's enemies, in sharing the common life of the family, the clan, and the nation, in joining in the worship of God. The tedium of Sheol lies in the fact that, while its occupants still exist, they can no longer enjoy life. The implication is that any victory over death must be a restoration of vital power and of the opportunity to exercise it in a world of men and things.

At this point we must pause for a moment to take notice of a view that stands in sharp contrast to all this: I mean the doctrine of the immortality of the soul as put forward and defended by the greatest of the Greek philosophers. This depends on making a sharp distinction between mind and matter, soul and body. Man is essentially a soul attached to, even imprisoned in, a body. That soul is akin to God and, when set free from its bodily prison-house with all its tainted associations, it can achieve its natural divinity or immortality—they come to much the same thing. As Cornford says, 'immortality in this sense is to be sharply distinguished from the mere continuance, in some unseen region, of a life resembling life on earth'.[10] It has to be added that, if we make this distinction—as I think we should—then the Bible, like most of us, is concerned precisely with the continuance somewhere of a life resembling, in essentials, if not in all respects, life on earth. Its presuppositions are much the same as ours: that, on the whole and at its best, life

8 A. R. Johnson, *op. cit.* 93 f.

9 This way of thinking persisted long. In the Talmud (Ned. 64b Bar) we are told of four classes of people who are considered as good as dead: the poor, the blind, the lepers and the childless. Again in *Sanh.* 47a Elisha's healing of Naaman's leprosy is equated with a raising from the dead. Cf. Strack-Billerbeck, *Komm.* iv. 751.

10 F. M. Cornford, *Greek Religious Thought from Homer to the Age of Alexander,* xxiv. This devaluation of the sensible world and its life, with the escapist eschatology that flows from it, reappears in some early Christian thinking, especially in heretical—Gnostic and Marcionite—doctrine.

is worth living, and that people are worth preserving. The developed teaching of the Bible could not rest content with the doctrine of Sheol, because, though the people who dwell there continue to exist, their existence is in no sense a life worth living. Nor can it accept the Greek doctrine of immortality as it stands because, whether or not the kind of life offered would be a life worth living, it would not be the whole man that would live it.[11]

In the Old Testament we are allowed to see the old doctrine of Sheol being superseded by the doctrine of the resurrection; and it is possible to follow the main lines of the spiritual progress which made the change inevitable. Broadly speaking, it is the revelation of the righteousness of God through the prophets that makes it necessary to go beyond Sheol. There are, I think, two outstanding moments in this progress; one is marked by the book of Job, the other by the book of Daniel.

In the book of Job we are presented with a major difficulty for faith in a righteous God. The matter can be put in this way. Granted that death reduces all men to the same level with complete disregard of character and achievement in this life; then it follows that if the Judge of all the earth is to do right by individual men and women, he must do it in this life. The rewards of virtue and the punishments of wickedness must come to the persons concerned before death. Afterwards it will be too late; for death puts us beyond the reach of rewards and punishments. But Job is presented to us as a man of exemplary character loaded with ghastly afflictions during his lifetime. His friends draw the only possible inference consistent with the justice of God, namely that his apparent virtue must be a mere façade covering deep-seated and persistent wickedness. Job, who knows his own integrity, cannot accept this way out. Yet how can he maintain his own righteousness without impugning that of God? One way out would be to postpone the rehabilitation of Job to the next life and find the statement of that belief in the famous passage in chapter xix, beginning, 'I know that my redeemer liveth'. I have not time to discuss the verses in detail and must be content to say that the admirable discussion by Professor Sutcliffe[12] seems to me to make it impossible to treat this passage as a statement of belief in the resurrection. I do not think that such a belief is present in the book; and when we take the book as it stands, it appears that the justice of God is to be vindicated and the character of Job cleared of suspicion by his restoration to health, happiness and prosperity *in this life*. But, of course, this is merely to shelve the problem. The story of Job is provided with a happy ending, but there are

[11] The issue has recently been stated clearly and uncompromisingly by Dr. L. P. Jacks in the opening chapter of his book, *Near the Brink*.
[12] *Op. cit.* 131-7.

other Jobs—and we know it—whose lives are not rounded off so neatly. The problem remains; and it is no solution to say that if we all got our deserts none would escape whipping, for that is merely to transfer to this life the ethical indifferentism of Sheol.

The problem remained to be raised in a more acute form than ever before in the middle of the second century before Christ. By that time the Jewish religion had become a clear-cut belief in one God, a belief which excluded any recognition whatsoever of any other deity. Along with this monotheistic faith went the moral obligation to give complete obedience to the commandments of God as set out in the Jewish law, and to have complete trust in God's promises as given in Scripture. In the sixties of the second century B.C. Judaea formed part of the Seleucid kingdom and the policy of the reigning monarch, Antiochus IV Epiphanes, was to make Greek culture and religion the way of life for all his subjects. The result was the first great clash between Church and State. It split the Jewish people and produced both apostates and martyrs. The issue of God's righteousness was presented in a more acute form than ever before. Was it right that those men and women who had laid down their lives in absolute loyalty to God, and those others who had saved their skins by apostasy should, in the end, share the same fate in the abode of the dead? The question demanded an answer; and only one answer was possible. For if God himself made no difference between loyalty and apostasy, it could mean one of two things: either the difference between loyalty and disloyalty was of no importance—which was unthinkable; or it was important, and God's servants were more aware of its importance than God himself—which was equally unthinkable. Only one possibility remained open: to declare that God would not make Sheol the last word. This declaration is made at the beginning of the twelfth chapter of the Book of Daniel.

'And at that time shall stand forth Michael, the great prince, who stands for the sons of thy people. And there shall be a time of tribulation, such as never was since there was a nation until that time. And in that time thy people shall be delivered, all who are found written in the book. And many of those who sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt.'

It is not necessary for our present purpose to give an exact interpretation of all the details of the pictures nor would time permit it. The essential thing is that it is being made quite plain that God's concern with men and women is an ethical concern which does not cease at death; and equally that men and women are accountable, and their responsibility is not wiped out in the grave.

In its first formulation the resurrection of the dead seems to

involve their return from the stark and gloomy underworld of Sheol to the light and warmth of this world, where they may resume life in its fullness, and take their fill of its joys and satisfactions. In this connection it is significant that in St. Matthew's account of the Resurrection of our Lord he tells that many dead people came out of their graves at the same time and were seen walking about in Jerusalem.[13] That shows what was ordinarily understood by the word resurrection. It was, of course, possible to think that the resurrection would be preceded by a radical transformation of the world, and that there would be a new heaven and a new earth; but it was the renewed earth that would be the habitation of those who rose to life.

These new beliefs were widely accepted in Jewish circles. The principal dissenting voice was that of the Sadducees, who were opposed to innovations of any kind and held fast to the old Hebrew orthodoxy of Sheol, the parity of the dead there, and the impossibility of release from its dismal confines. On this, as on other points, the Sadducees were the fundamentalists of Judaism in their day; but I cannot stay to moralize on that interesting fact. The main point to which I would draw attention is that it was on this issue of resurrection that they came into open conflict with our Lord, and so provided the occasion for further elucidation of the doctrine of life after death.

Two passages in the Gospels call for special consideration at this point. The first is the parable of Dives and Lazarus.[14] I cannot but think that this parable is directed against the Sadducees. Dives himself is a typical member of their class and he and his brothers are convinced believers in the common lot of all the inhabitants of Sheol. It is consequently a great shock to him to discover when he arrives that there is no parity there. The kind of justice that obtains beyond the grave is sketched in the broadest outlines, so much so that it might be called rough justice. I suspect, though, that we are not meant to spend a great deal of time working out the precise merits and demerits of the two men and trying to decide whether their fates in the next world correspond exactly with what we should think they deserve. The essence of the matter is that there is an assessment made and that it determines what shall happen to the people concerned. Jesus affirms the Jewish doctrine that men carry their past record with them beyond death and that they are answerable for their own character and conduct. It is men and women who live on after death, not shades or disembodied thinking-machines.

The second passage is the dispute between Jesus and the

[13] *Matt.* xxvii. 52 f. It is not necessary for our present purpose to discuss the question of the historicity of this particular detail.

[14] *Luke*, xvi, 19-31.

Sadducees, who put to him the hypothetical case of a woman who, under the regulations concerning Levirate marriage, was the wife of seven brothers in succession. This leads up to the supposedly unanswerable question: In the resurrection, when they rise again, whose wife will she be?[15] The form of this question, and indeed the whole statement of the problem, would suggest that the resurrection under discussion is one in which men and women come back from Sheol to this world to resume their life as it was before death carried them away. It would have been a sufficient answer to the legal quibble in the question to point out that Solomon in his lifetime actually had a considerable number of wives simultaneously, and that it would be equally reasonable to ask whose husband he was. Jesus, however, refuses to be involved in mock litigation about the conjugal rights of hypothetical husbands, and instead uses the case to bring out two great positive teachings about the resurrection.

He begins by accusing the Sadducees of ignorance of the Scriptures and the power of God.[16] He then goes on to show what kind of life the dead rise to, and why we must believe that they do rise. First, the kind of life: it is like that of the angels. We should not be in too great a hurry to assume that this means that we are to substitute the Greek doctrine of the immortality of disembodied souls for the doctrine of the resurrection.[17] The Jewish mind—and it was to Jewish minds that our Lord was speaking—thought of angels primarily as personal beings, living in a society, and living to do God's will. The resurrection-life is to be thought of as life of this kind and quality. It will be a shared experience because

[15] *Mark* xii, 18-27, with parallels in *Matt.* xxii, 23-33; *Luke* xx, 27-38.

[16] I think I should mention here the comment which I heard given by my teacher, Herbert Loewe, on this phrase. He suggested that 'the power of God' is a reference to that very ancient part of the Synagogue liturgy, the Eighteen Benedictions, and in particular to the second of them, which is concerned with the resurrection. The text runs, 'Thou are mighty, who bringest low the proud; (thou art) strong and judgest the ruthless, living for ever thou raisest the dead, makest the wind to blow, sendest down the dew, sustainest the living, quickenest the dead; in the twinkling of an eye thou makest salvation to spring forth for us. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who quickenest the dead.' It is very significant that in this benediction which is so largely occupied with the activity of God in sustaining and restoring life to the world, he should be addressed in the very first clause as 'mighty'; and it is tempting to suppose that 'the power of God' in *Mark* is an echo of 'the mighty One' of the second Benediction. If this is so, the force of the remark is, 'You don't know either your Bible or your Prayer Book.'

I do not know whether Loewe ever published this very attractive suggestion: I cannot recall ever seeing it in print. I mention it here in order that it may not be forgotten and that he may have the credit for it.

[17] This is perhaps the moment to mention that curiosity of patristic exegesis by which the Lucan form of the saying ἰσάγγελοι γάρ εἰσιν was interpreted to mean that the number of persons to be raised from death to life will be exactly equal to the number of angels who fell with Satan, and that in this way the host of heaven will be brought up to full strength. There is an echo of this interpretation in the Prayer Book service for the Burial of the Dead in the petition 'that it may please thee . . . shortly to accomplish the number of thine elect.' cf. E. Evans, *Saint Augustine's Enchiridion*, 117.

those who live it will have a common interest, the love and service of God. Elsewhere in the teaching of our Lord he uses the figure of a banquet at which the patriarchs of old and the men and women of a later day sit down together.[18] Again we have to realize that the imagery is not to be taken literally. It is meant to convey to us that the resurrection-life has its full happiness, and that that happiness is found and enjoyed in the company of others. The resurrection-life is the life of a society: it is not lived in solitude.

I venture to think that the caution against pressing metaphorical language too far applies also in the case of the parable of the sheep and goats.[19] It is clear that it means to tell us that men are answerable for their conduct and that they will have to answer. It is not by any means so clear that we should conceive of the fate of the unrighteous as one of everlasting torment.[20] From what we otherwise know of the mind and heart of Jesus it is possible to think of Him as contemplating total destruction for the completely incorrigible: I do not find it possible to think of Him as willingly accepting and approving the blind and senseless brutality of infinite punishment for finite offences, or, what is worse, the amoral despotism of predestination and election.

Such things as these are incompatible with the concept of God which provides the basis for belief in the resurrection. The argument which our Lord uses in favour of the doctrine makes belief in a resurrection to everlasting torment absurd. To that argument I now turn.

As it stands it is so compressed in statement that at first sight it seems to be a mere verbal quibble. It is only when we consider it carefully that its real profundity and cogency appear. Jesus goes back to the primary revelation which called Israel into existence as the people of God, and made known to them the name and nature of God whom henceforth they were to worship and obey. In the Mosaic account of the origin and constitution of Israel, at the point where God spoke to him from the burning bush, we learn that God described himself in these terms: 'I am the God of Abraham and the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob'. At the time when these words are spoken Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are all long since dead. Now if death and Sheol are the last word, God ought to be saying something like this: 'When Abraham was alive I was his God; and so with Isaac and Jacob. I am ready to be to their descendants what I was to them in their day'. But that clearly will not do. The words actually used by God must mean that He cares for Abraham, Isaac and Jacob; and if He cares for them,

[18] *Matt.* viii, 11f; *Luke,* xiii, 29.
[19] *Matt.* xxv, 31-46.
[20] I say this in spite of verse 46, which I am strongly inclined to regard as editorial comment. The proper climax has been reached in verse 45.

they cannot be abandoned to the living death of the Sheol of Sadducean orthodoxy. Moreover if God cares for the patriarchs individually, we may make bold to believe that He cares for other people individually; and because He cares for them, they are safe in His hands. The God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob is also, and in the same full sense, the God of John Smith, William Brown and Henry Robinson. Because He cares for them one at a time they need no longer fear death. The basis of our Lord's teaching on life after death is the fact that God has a personal care for the individual human person.

So much for the teaching of Jesus. It is only a bare outline that can be offered here; but for our immediate purpose a statement of the essential points of the teaching may serve. We turn now to the resurrection of Jesus himself. Here again we can deal only in broad outlines. The big difference between the *Phaedo* and the Gospels is that while the *Phaedo* offers reasons for thinking that after death the soul of Socrates will continue to exist somewhere or somehow away from the entanglements of the material world, the Gospels give an account of the return of Jesus after death to rejoin His disciples, to stop their talking about Him in the past tense, to revive the fellowship, and to continue His ministry in the world. The Church, which is His body, is the first corollary of His resurrection; and it is most right and proper that the last word of the Gospel should be, 'Lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the world.'

But that is not all. Along with this perpetual presence of Christ living on in the Church there goes the picture of the exalted Christ seated at the right hand of God in the heavenly places. The risen life of the Lord is life lived on two planes. This is something that we are not in a position to understand properly, much less to explain. It is something which we only begin to experience in the life of the Christian fellowship on this side of the grave. According to St. Paul, the Christian in baptism dies with Christ and rises again into the life of Christ's body, the Church. So far he shares the resurrection-life of Christ in this world, on the mundane level. But, also according to St. Paul, when the Christian dies he goes to be with Christ, that is, to share the resurrection-life of Christ on another level. For the Christian there is in this world a real, though necessarily limited, experience of the risen life of Christ.

The matter may perhaps be illustrated by an analogy. If we lived in a world of only two spatial dimensions, many things in the three-dimensional world would be simply incomprehensible to us. For example, if the picture of a man climbing a spiral staircase could be projected into our two-dimensional world he would seem to be walking round and round in a circle. If the projection was

made from a different angle he would appear to be walking in a straight line. He would never appear to be doing what in fact he is doing, climbing up a staircase. The only way in which we could know the full truth of the matter would be by having the third dimension added to our experience.

I suspect it is something like this in the resurrection-life. It is not a case of losing a dimension—time for example: 'timeless life' is a contradiction in terms—but of gaining one; and to gain one is to open up vistas of experience as unimaginable to us now as climbing a spiral staircase would be to dwellers in two-dimensional space.

There is no end of speculations of this kind about the resurrection-life, and no harm in them. But all such speculations presuppose the resurrection faith; and, if I have understood the teaching of the Bible aright, that faith is always a corollary to the justice and love of our Father in Heaven.

* * *

The Memoir of the late Dr. Grieve for which we hoped has been written by his son-in-law, the Reverend Charles Surman of Erdington, Secretary of the Congregational Historical Society, and may be had from The Bursar, Lancashire College, Manchester 16, price 6s. post free. We understand that a limited edition only is being printed and that it is selling well. Early application is therefore advised. We have seen the proofs and are much tempted to put in our thumb and pull out a plum, or two. But we will use our little space to recommend you to buy the book.

* * *

A much beloved lecturer in philosophy who is a frequent and welcome visitor in the pulpits of little country chapels in west Wales and honours his congregations by sharing with them his deep religious faith and the exact and scrupulous manner of his thought, told his hearers one recent Sunday, "Jesus Christ once said—and I am inclined to agree with Him . . . ."

J. M. P.

PREPARATION FOR COMMUNION: A PURITAN MANUAL

By Wilfred W. Biggs, B.D., M.Th.

The fact that the Lord's Table, which should be a symbol of Christian unity, is in fact a focal point of deep-seated disunity, is something that must give pain to every Christian. There is of course nothing new or modern about this fact, and it must be recognized that much of the controversy has its roots in deeply-felt and carefully thought-out doctrinal positions.

In almost every age, the Lord's Table has been the subject of disputes, and, in this respect, the middle of the seventeenth century was no exception. Roman Catholics, Anglicans of the Laudian School, Puritans and Separatists of all types, joined in the various controversies which raged; and from the presses there came forth a veritable torrent of literature on the subject. Richard Vines, a Puritan divine, whose posthumous work[1] contains a warm commendation from Richard Baxter, remarks: 'There hath been more paper written on those six syllables, but five in English, *This is my body*, than would contain a just and large commentary upon the whole Bible.'[2]

There was controversy about the Table itself (whether it was an Altar or not); there was controversy about who should be admitted to the Sacrament; there was controversy about the mode of partaking; there was controversy about the precise nature of the consecrated elements, their mode of operation, and their efficacy as a seal to the Covenant. With the exception of the Quakers and the extreme Radicals, all were agreed as to the vital necessity and importance of the Sacrament. It is when beliefs go deepest that feelings run highest—men get really angry only about things that really matter to them. It must be confessed that much of the controversial literature of the period is too bitter in tone for modern taste, and the arguments are based upon what we should regard as most unsatisfactory Biblical exegesis, but beneath the bitterness and the queer exegesis there usually lie deep religious feeling and valuable insights into sacramental truth.

Thus, in addition to, and often in conjunction with, the controversial sacramental writings of the middle of the seventeenth century, we find much stress laid on the devotional aspect of the

1 *A Treatise of the Right Institution, Administration and Receiving of the Lord's Supper* (1657).

2 *Ibid*, p. 3.

Lord's Supper. In this, men of vastly different outlook speak much the same language. (This fact will not come as a surprise to those who have an intimate knowledge of men and women belonging to widely different denominational and theological groups today.) Some of the Puritan sacramental manuals are rich in spiritual insight and fervour. It has often been pointed out that it is in the realm of devotion that we can discern Puritanism at its best.

One of the aspects of Communion thought and practice that most concerned the thinkers and writers of the age was that of 'Worthy Receiving'. Much was written about the problem connected with the due examination of those who would partake of the elements. In reaction against the Anglican practice of 'Pell-Mell Admission' (as an opponent called it), or of making the Table an 'Inne for all comers', many Puritans stressed the vital necessity of testing the worthiness of those who would partake. The Presbyterians in particular were very strict in their examination—they rigorously excluded all who failed to show that they were fit to sit at the Table. A Bar was placed around the Table to keep away those who might profane it, and, at the same time, eat and drink condemnation to themselves.

While this practice was violently opposed by many, all were agreed on the need for *self*-examination before partaking of the Lord's Supper. There is one Pauline text which is quoted again and again by writers of all shades of thought. 'Let a man examine himself and so let him eat of the bread and drink of that cup.' (I *Corinthians* xi, 28.) Whatever might be felt about examination by Minister, Minister and Elders, or by any other officials, it was agreed on all sides that there lay upon each communicant the duty and responsibility of seeking to fit himself for the sacrament by rigorous self-examination and preparation.

To this end there was no scarcity of instruction. Not only were sermons preached, giving guidance to their hearers as to the method of such self-examination and preparation, but many of these were subsequently published, to form, with other manuals, a veritable library on the theme. As an indication of the wide range of outlook represented, the following may be mentioned. John Reading,[3] a Royalist who was at one time Chaplain to Charles I, and who was imprisoned by the Parliamentarians, wrote a manual entitled, *Brief Instructions concerning the Holy Sacrament for their use who propose to receive the Lord's Supper* (1645). Henry Tozer,[4] a Royalist who in ecclesiastical affairs was a Puritan, issued, *Direction for a godly life, especially for communicating at the Lord's Table* (1628). Jeremiah Dyke,[5] a Puritan, wrote, *The*

[3] 1588-1667. *cf. Dictionary of National Biography, s.v.*
[4] 1602-1650. *cf. D.N.B., s.v.*
[5] d. 1620. *cf. D.N.B., s.v.*

Worthy Communicant, which had gone into its sixteenth edition by 1680; while *A Treatise concerning the Lord's Supper,* by a non-conformist, Thomas Doolittle[6], reached its ninth edition in the previous year. From the manuals themselves it would not always be easy to discover the ecclesiastical allegiance of their authors. They share a common faith and experience.

One of the loveliest and most rewarding of all these manuals is that of Francis Roberts.[7] Roberts is an interesting personality quite apart from the fact that he wrote this book. He studied at Trinity College, Oxford. At the outbreak of the Civil War he joined the Presbyterian party, and was instituted to the living of Wrington in Somerset. At the Restoration he conformed, and was left undisturbed. It may be said with truth that he was not a very gallant figure, but (as A. G. Matthews suggested to the Congregational Historical Society[8]) he, and incumbents like him, may be regarded as not untypical of the clergy of the period. In any case, let us not decry the value of his manual on the score of his lack of consistency during a time of great upheaval.

Roberts's words had been addressed first to his own congregation at Wrington. If even a proportion of the latter had followed his advice in regard to Preparation for the Sacrament, the Lord's Supper there must have been an occasion of great blessedness. Like other Puritans, he insists that the Sacrament is nothing without the faith of the communicants. Thus, in the Preface to his work, he states: 'It is not bare partaking, but due partaking of the Sacraments, that will commend us to God, and interest us in Christ.' The mere fact of being a Christian in name, or even being an actual church member, does not of itself ensure a worthy partaking. 'They that partake Sacraments in a visible church may so farre notwithstanding be displeasing unto God,' he asserts.

Roberts accepts the necessity for the examination of prospective communicants by the church. 'There's *A publick Ecclesiastical examination* by Church-governours, preparing for fit communicating in respect of the Church' (p. 1). But, unlike some of his contemporaries, that is not the question which especially concerns him. 'There's also *a private self-examination* . . . self-examination is more especially needful' (p. 2). The words of St. Paul, quoted above, provide him with his text, and the whole manual is an attempt to help readers to prepare themselves for a worthy partaking of the sacrament.

First of all, he points out the necessity of assurance as to one's right to the Supper. He suggests that this right is two-fold; Out-

6 1632?-1707. *cf. D.N.B., s.v. Cf. Calamy Revised, s.v.*

7 *A Communicant Instructed.* (Dedicatory Epistle, June 12th, 1651.) For Roberts (1609-1675) *cf. D.N.B., s.v.* Quotations from 3rd Edition, 1659.

8 *Cf. Transactions,* Vol. xvi, No. 4, pp. 176/7.

ward and Inward. With the careful logic characteristic of the writing of the period, Roberts distinguishes two elements in the former right. It may be, *'More Remote and Mediate,* when by virtue of our membership (being baptized though we be but Infants) we have a *Jus ad rem* . . . though no present capacity and fitnesse for it: *More Near and Intermediate,* when by reason of our qualifications, of competent knowledge, and unblameableness of life we have *Jus in re,* a right in the Lord's Supper in respect of the Church, so that the Church may not exclude us, but ought to admit us' (p. 4). All this may seem somewhat pedantic and unreal to modern minds, but when we remember the state of confusion that exists among us in regard to church membership, and its connection with baptism, perhaps it is not so hopelessly unreal after all. When Roberts turns to the 'Inward right' to the Supper, he speaks to the very heart of the matter. 'When we not only outwardly professe to be, but inwardly and indeed are Foederates with God in Christ in the New Covenant, sealed by the Lord's Supper . . .' then indeed our right is sure. 'Our true *Inward Right* to the Lord's Supper, we may discover by our inward right to, and actual interest in, the *New Covenant* . . . for the Lord's Supper is the Token and Seale of the New Covenant' (p. 5). 'Art thou thy whole selfe, not only some part of thy selfe given up to God? . . . . Is thy tongue his, to praise him; thy hands his, to work his will; thy feet his, to walk in his paths; thy minde his, to know him; thy conscience his, to accuse, or excuse, under him; thy will his, to obey him; thy memory his, to retain him; thy heart his, to desire him and love him, yea to embrace him with most ravish't affections beyond all; and in a word is thy whole selfe, soul and body, with all that is within thee, wholly his, sincerely to serve him, and to be a spiritual sacrifice to him? Then thou art in New Covenant with God indeed, and hast inward Right to the Lord's Supper' (p. 11).

The Supper is a Seal, and in itself is but an empty token. The thing of vital importance is the Lord's Covenant with his people, and it is as a seal to that covenant that the Supper is of such significance. To partake of the Supper without being in covenant with God in Christ is as useless as sealing a blank sheet of paper. Thus before all else it is necessary to be sure of having a right to God's covenant mercies. This involves, as Roberts suggests, Knowing the Lord; Having the Law written on the heart; Knowing and accepting divine forgiveness; Having the Fear of God. Self-examination was meant to probe the depths of faith and life—it was concerned not only with outward conduct (which alone was open to others' judgment) but with the state of the heart.

Having carefully examined the meaning of an Inner Right to the Sacrament, Roberts asks his readers to ponder a further

question: 'What need we have of the Lord's Supper?' In other words, they are urged to draw near to the Table not just vaguely thinking that it is to their benefit, but to come with a clear notion of both the nature of the Sacrament, and also of the way in which it meets their needs. Wherein lies their deepest need? How is it to be satisfied? To anyone who might imagine that he could manage quite well, that he was in no real need, Roberts has a short answer, 'Thy whole new man, when at perfectest, is but imperfect' (p. 15). In matters of this sort the Puritans were debtors to the Apostle Paul. However arrogant and conceited they may appear to be in their controversial writings, they were deeply conscious of their unworthiness before the Holy God, and they had few illusions as to their need for forgiveness. It was in no spirit of self-confidence that they dared to draw near to the Table of the Lord.

But what is to be looked for? What needs are there to be satisfied? 'It's *A Supper*, therefore suitable to nourish the inward man,' is Roberts's short answer (p. 16). Like so many of his contemporaries, he lays stress on the 'meal' aspect of the Sacrament. It was this stress which led many to urge that *Sitting* (rather than *Kneeling*) was more congruous with the nature and purpose of the rite. The Supper is a banquet spread for the faithful, who are called by the Lord to sit and to partake for the upbuilding of their souls. The soul needs to be fed. 'Thou canst not live without Christ and his death; hast thou not need that Christ and his death should still live in thy heart and memory?' he asks. 'Consequently thou hast great need of the Lord's Supper. The Lord's Supper is a lasting Monument of Christ's death, A Marble Pillar on Christ's grave. Christ living erected this Monument and Memorial of Christ dying' (p. 20). There is a touch of Zwinglian doctrine here, though it would be difficult to apply the criticism, 'mere memorial', to these lovely words. 'Canst thou see this bread broken . . . and not call to minde (according to Scripture) Christ's Agony in the Garden, his sufferings in the High Priest's Palace and his Cross on Mount Calvary, in all which places he freely shed his blood for thee? Canst thou take and eate this bread; take and drink this Cup; and in so doing not apprehend Christ stooping from heaven, to feed thy soul with bread of life, his own body; and water of life, his own blood? Christ bowing his head upon the Crosse to kisse thee; Christ opening his side to heal and wash thee; and Christ condescending to thy senses as once to *Thomas* saying, *Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands, and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side, and be not faithless, but believing*? (pp. 20/1).

The Supper is a memorial meal, but it is much more. 'Christ's blood was shed meritoriously to procure our sins remission, and

the Lord's Supper is appointed, to signifie and seal up to us this remission of sins in Christ's blood' (p. 18). Roberts does not attempt to explain what exactly his view is of this aspect of sacramental doctrine. Perhaps in a book of devotion it is as well to leave it just there. Remission of sins is needed by the searching soul; the sacrament is the seal of that remission displayed by Christ in his death.

But even now we have not plumbed the depths of human need which may be satisfied at the Table. Carrying further his stress on the sacrament as a banquet, Roberts points his readers to the greatest need of all; the need of fellowship with the Risen Christ. 'Now therefore to this purpose thou hast great need of the Lord's Supper, which to thy soul, to thy faith, yea even to thy outward senses, signifies, seals, and instrumentally exhibits this communion with Christ and his death' (pp. 22/3). It is not a mere memorial of a sacrifice long ago accomplished, it is a personal communion with a living Lord.

This fact carries with it a further implication. Fellowship with Christ involves fellowship with one another. Roberts knew much about disunity and acrimonious divisions. We talk today about our unhappy divisions—the seventeenth-century divisions were even unhappier. 'There's great need of maintaining and confirming Union and Communion of Saints, and especially in such times as these are, wherein Professors of Christ have, by their unparalleled divisions, both in Judgment, Affection and Practice, brought such reproach upon the Gospel and way of truth. . . . In this regard what need is there of the Lord's Supper, which in the nature of it tends so much to unite, cement, knit and solder together the disjointed members of Christ's body?' (p. 25). But, it may be urged, is it not a fact that the Table itself is a source of disunity? From one point of view that is so; but, on the other hand, it is at the Table that we may in the Spirit surmount many barriers, and also be led to face with shame the scandal of our disunity, and, it is hoped, be led to resolve it.

Roberts next turns to consider what he calls: 'Present Fitnesse for the Lord's Supper.' His words are addressed to those who have a Right (Inward and Outward) to the sacrament, and who recognize that they need what is offered at the Table. What qualities are to be looked for in those who would accept the Lord's invitation? He lists: Knowledge; Faith; Repentance; Obedience; Love; A Spiritual Appetite. Such a meticulous division of qualities may seem to us to smack of the study rather than of the Table itself, but we must be careful not to apply modern standards to the work of a seventeenth-century writer. The careful and logical division of a theme into its constituent parts is typical of the period—as

much a convention as the 'three points' of a modern sermon!

The first need is for competent knowledge. Roberts means intellectual knowledge, knowledge about the facts of the faith. This reminds us of the place that catechizing had in the church life of the time (a perusal of Baxter's *Reformed Pastor* enables us to see whence came the knowledge of which Roberts writes in his manual). A glance at seventeenth-century sermons, with their weighty expositions of the Scriptures and Scriptural doctrines, also helps us to understand how it was possible for communicants to possess the requisite knowledge. Recent stress on Scriptural and doctrinal preaching suggests that we no longer dismiss such knowledge as being hopelessly intellectual, unnecessary for the ordinary Christian.

What should a communicant know? 'That God is;' 'That God is one;' 'That this one God subsisteth in three distinct persons;' 'That this one God is a most pure invisible spirit;' 'That this one God hath made himself gloriously known, partly by his essential attributes or properties, partly by his works' (pp. 30/31). In addition to this knowledge of God, there is need to possess knowledge of ourselves, what we are by nature and what we may become in Christ. To this again must be added a knowledge of Jesus Christ, His nature and His attributes. All this is somewhat formal and factual, but when he comes to consider our knowledge of Christ, Roberts strikes a more personal and intimate note. Christ is the True Messiah, Son of Mary, the God-Man, the Mediator, the All-Sufficient. But He is these things, 'Only to whom he is actually applied . . . . No union, no communion' (p. 81). Thus this seemingly intellectual preparation is not purely formal and doctrinal; it is inseparable from personal fellowship. For all his stress on intellectual knowledge, Roberts at no time suggests that it can in itself promote communion; what it can and does do is to make communion fuller, because more charged with understanding.

In order to derive full benefit from the sacrament, it is necessary to have knowledge of the New Covenant and of the Supper itself. 'The New Covenant is a covenant of reconciliation made by God as a redeemer with the sinner', says Roberts. It is, 'upon terms of faith and new obedience, as the fruit thereof, and testification of our thankfulnesse. . . . The New Covenant is with persons, unable of themselves to do anything acceptable before God without divine grace assisting, and therefore performing covenant only in Jesus Christ their surety' (p. 83). Humble dependence on divine grace—without this no one can partake worthily. And, as we have already seen, the Covenant and the Supper are inseparable in the writer's mind. Quoting *Matthew* xxvi, 28, he urges that, 'this wine in the cup is a signe and seale of my blood by which the New Testament

is ratified. So that by the Lord's Supper the New Testament or New Covenant is confirmed to us: and in receiving the Lord's Supper, we renew covenant with God' (p. 82).

With regard to the Supper itself, there is much that needs to be known in order to fit oneself for partaking. First of all it is necessary to be clear why God uses sacraments at all. 'The Lord has been wont to deal with his Church and people by way of sacraments in all times and ages' (p. 90). This is, 'from God's familiar love and condescension to his people, delighting most plainly and easily to make known spirituals unto them. From the abstrusenesse and mysteriousness of Christ, and the things of Christ, which are sublime, high, heavenly, worthy of the quickest inspection of Angels themselves, and therefore so farre above humane apprehension in their heavenly lustre, that God represents them in earthly resemblances. From the dulnesse of our understandings, in conceiving aright the great Mysteries of Christ, therefore God stoops to us, setting them forth in sensible and visible Elements. He descends to our carnalnesse, that we may ascend to His spiritualnesse. He helps our outward senses, that they may help our inward graces' (pp. 91/2). Many humble souls before and since have been able to bear witness to the wonderful effectiveness of the Lord's condescension. 'He was known to them in the breaking of Bread'.

Roberts asserts categorically: 'Whatsoever Sacraments are, they are wholly by institution. We have no other particular ground, or foundation for them at all' (p. 92). The Dominical Institution of the Supper is not only assumed without question, it is regarded as essential to its real significance. Is not our author right here? If the sacrament is not in this sense, 'given', wherein lies its essential meaning and efficacy for the partaker? The communicant is invited to draw near in full assurance of faith, knowing that it is the Lord who extends the invitation. It is not altogether surprising that the manual goes on to assert: 'both Minister and People respectively must cleave close to the Institution. The nearer we come up thereto, the more acceptable we are to the Lord' (p. 93). This Biblical literalism, which we have already mentioned as being a feature of the thought of the age, was one reason for the objection voiced by many Puritans to the Anglican practice of kneeling at the Table to receive the Elements. As Christ and His Disciples did not kneel, no more may we. Readers are urged to realize that, 'he who truely partakes the signe according to Christ's institution, partakes also the thing signified. This is to be well observed as a special ground of comfort in communicating' (p. 96).

Thus Christians are asked to search their minds and hearts,

and to ponder the nature of God and of his ways with men, in order to fit themselves for sitting at the Table. Roberts brings this section of his manual to a close by describing in general terms the properties of true sanctified knowledge. It should be:—Experimental; Heart-humbling and soul-abasing; communicative to others' edification; Growing and Prosperous; Affectionate and heart-affecting; Spiritualized; Pure; Obediential, practical, and fruitful in all good works. Thus in spite of what has already been said about the intellectual character of the knowledge demanded, it is clear that there was nothing purely formal and remote about it.

Faith is another requisite for the Worthy Communicant. It is described as, 'a grace of the regenerating spirit' (p. 111). It is not a mere historical faith, based on past facts, nor yet one based upon miracles past or present. Faith is that, 'whereby a man knowing and assenting to the truth of God's record touching Christ, accepts him upon his own terms for salvation' (p. 112). Without such a faith, however feeble it may be, it is impossible to receive that which is offered at the Table. Rather crudely perhaps, but yet vividly, Roberts suggests that Faith is, 'The Spiritual mouth and stomack, whereby we eat and digest Christ received' (p. 115). Without faith it is impossible to discern the Lord's Body, or to apply the sacramental mysteries when they are discerned. Faith, 'softens, supples and melts the heart'. It, 'wonderfully loosens and unglues the heart of the Christian from the world and all earthly felicities'. It is, 'attended with sense of its own infirmity', and yet, 'upholds the believer's spirit from sinking and fainting under heaviest pressures and extremities of trouble'. Further, it 'is daily growing and constantly persevering' (pp. 116-125). Such is the need of the fit communicant. 'Lord, increase my Faith', must be the ever-uttered prayer of one who would prepare to accept the Lord's invitation to His Table.

If faith is real, there is bound to be an awareness of the need for Repentance. 'No duty can be performed acceptably by impenitent sinners' (p. 126). For the Puritan, the Roman Confessional was replaced by the more intimate and heart-searching personal confession of the individual soul to its maker. As by other writers, the three notes of Conviction, Contrition, and Conversion are sounded by Roberts, as being essential steps in the preparation for worthy receiving.

From the need for repentance, the manual turns to the need for Obedience; for, 'without true obedience all outward professions of religion, seeming love to God's Ordinances, and outward performances of services, are disregarded of God, as vain, hypocritical, and abominable' (p. 139). Roberts cannot be accused of being over-

theoretical in his instructions. He calls for faith and works—faith issuing in works. 'The Lord's Supper, being a Token and Seal of the New Covenant . . . is also a Bond and Obligation to New Obedience, whereby we solemnly engage ourselves to fear and obey God for ever, as his Covenant-people. And as oft as we renew the Lord's Supper, so oft we renew this bond of Obedience; without true Obedience, communicating is but dissembling with God' (p. 139). These are solemn and heart-searching words. The Supper is a *Sacramentum*. And even if we are stirred to obey the Lord's commands at no other time, surely we should be moved as we approach the Table! 'In the Lord's Supper we have a solemn record and memorial of the rarest and highest obedience in the world' (p. 139).

Love too, is required; both love for Christ, and also love for other Christians. 'The Lord's Supper is a sweet love-token betwixt Christ and his Church. . . . Herein they mutually seal up their reciprocal affections to each other' (p. 149). Is this the dull and dismal faith attributed to our Puritan forefathers? Is this the cold and hard Puritanism of popular imagination? 'The Lord's Supper is a sacramental seal and token not only of our communion with Christ, but also of our communion with his members, of our fellowship with the Saints' (p. 167). It is possible to discern here one of the essential differences between the 'Laudian' sacrament of the altar, and the Puritan Supper of the Lord. The Laudian drew near primarily to offer a sacrifice in memory of the Crucified Christ. The Puritan drew near primarily to meet his Risen Lord in the fellowship of His body—the Church. In preparing to partake of the feast, let love be in the heart, for, 'without true brotherly love . . . we shall but deal hypocritically in the Lord's Supper, professing Union and Communion with the brethren, to whom we have no true love, which is the bond of this Union and Communion' (p. 168).

Roberts has one thing more to add. How is it possible to be a worthy communicant unless all these other qualities are coupled with, 'a good sharp lively communion-appetite'? Such an appetite, 'would be often eating. . . . The misse of this Ordinance, paines and grieves the soule of an hunger-bitten Christian'. 'Had we such hunger and thirst after Christ as they' (Roberts means the Early Church) 'had, we should desire the Lord's Supper, as often as conveniently it might be had. What weak and bad appetites have they, that can content themselves with once communicating in the yeare, at Easter: yea perhaps with once in five or six years?' (p. 193). Both Calvin and Knox would have liked to establish weekly communions; and it is evident that, despite the usual

practice of monthly observance, many Puritans too would have liked to have had the Table spread more often.

Such are some of the instructions which Francis Roberts gave to his people at Wrington, to help them to examine and prepare themselves for the Lord's Supper. In the same manual he also deals at some length with, 'Directions touching the right use of the Lord's Supper in Communicating'. And he concludes his work with, 'Directions touching our Christian Conversation suitable to the Lord's Supper after we have communicated'. With real pastoral concern, he urges his readers, as no doubt he had often urged his hearers, to approach the Table, 'in an humble sense of thy self-unworthinesse'. True self-examination would inevitably have that effect. Yet even the unworthy may draw near, trusting in the grace of God, who in mercy has not only given Christ for the remission of sins, but has also granted to sinful men the sacraments as a means whereby their vision may be cleared and their understanding enlightened.

Self-examination always reveals unworthiness. In this Roberts has the support of most of his contemporaries. Jeremiah Dyke, for example, asserts: 'No man can come worthily as he ought'.[9] Though, 'according to man's preparation will be his profit'.[10] How then may the communicant draw near in full assurance of faith? Thomas Purchas has a most satisfying answer. 'The feeling of the want of grace, with a grief for that want, is grace'.[11] In any case, it is not left to the individual to decide whether or not he is fit to partake. 'The self-examiner must be a receiver . . . it is not left indifferent for a man to come or not to come, but commanded . . . . It is the Lord by the mouth of the Minister, he it is that bids his guests, shall he cry come and shall we not come?'[12]

In how many of our Churches today is there any really consistent attempt made to prepare for Communion? How many church members seek by self-examination to make themselves the better able to partake of the Lord's Supper? It may be argued, with some justification, that the Puritans over-emphasized the need for fitness in this matter—too much introspection is never healthy, and ought not to be encouraged. But to partake of the Supper without serious thought as to its meaning and purpose, and without serious thought as to our need and our necessary response, is surely to be deplored at least as much, or more. Francis Roberts's manual may not be the most suitable for use in our day, but it does give a heart-searching portrait of 'An Instructed Communicant'.

9 *The Worthy Communicant*, p. 16.
10 *Ibid*, p. 13.
11 *The Communicants' Duty*, p. 306.
12 *Ibid*, pp. 295/6.

FEWER MEN FOR THE MINISTRY

By Daniel T. Jenkins, M.A., B.D.

Attention has recently been called to the so-called non-theological factors in relations between the various Churches. As many have suspected, they are far more numerous and far subtler in their operation, both positively and negatively, than we have yet allowed for. Few Churches are able to step outside themselves and look at themselves as institutions in their general social and historical setting, and not many Church leaders appear to see that the methods of the social sciences and the history of culture might have a certain limited, but real, usefulness for them. A cynic might almost define an ecclesiastical statesman as an expert at covering up hard facts in an inspirational fog, until the Church blunders unexpectedly into them, and then has to make a rapid and panic-stricken adjustment. We all tell each other that we live in a planned society in these days, but it must sometimes look to the outsider as though the Churches think that they can best fulfil their function by telling the rest of society how it should plan itself while remaining cheerfully haphazard themselves. When we do plan, it is generally to adjust ourselves to a situation whose characteristics have already stabilized themselves. It is rarely that we do so with a view to playing a significant part in forming a new situation.

With considerations like these in mind it may be useful to look at the question of the supply of ministers in Congregationalism. The absence of a closely-knit central organization and of an appointed Book of Common Prayer make the quality of the ministry an even more important matter in Congregationalism than in most other denominations. If their ministers are not competent and faithful, Congregational churches have few safeguards, other than those provided by the qualities of their members, from being led astray. The question of an adequate supply of competent and highly-trained ministers is, therefore, one of the utmost concern to those who are responsible for the future well-being of the denomination. Yet the very nature of our organization is such that we find it difficult to look at it in a wide enough context and plan accordingly. It would be as untrue as it would be improper for me to suggest that there is not a great deal of anxious thought given to this question in our own denomination as in others.

Like most other denominations, we suffer from a shortage of ministers. Many of our churches who want ministers cannot find them, and the supply of ministers from the colleges is inadequate to

meet the demand. This latter fact has been concealed by the post-war bulge in the colleges, but that bulge, to use modern jargon, has now flattened out. In Scotland, I understand, they are deeply disturbed by the fact that the number of first-year students in all the theological colleges of the Kirk last year was only 37, whereas they reckon to need 100 a year. Most of us can tell a roughly similar story.

What the normal reaction to this has been we have already seen. The churches have gone into a great bustle to recruit men for the ministry. The Church of England has, perhaps, been more active than the Free Churches in this but that has been largely because its need has been more obvious and acute. An impressive report on training for the ministry has been produced. Steps have been taken to ensure that the claims of the ministry were presented along with those of other professions to young men in the Forces and leaving school. A stirring pamphlet was published with the title "More Men for the Ministry", and so on.

Now all that activity was necessary and I think it can be shown that it produced some useful results. What may be called into question is the assumption often made that recruitment for the ministry operates on a simple basis of supply and demand. People tend to argue like this:—'The existing institutional organization of the Church demands so many ministers for its functioning in its present form. Very well, then, let us appeal to the young men of the churches to come forward to fill the vacant places, confident that if we make the appeal eloquent and imaginative enough they will be forthcoming.' But the matter is much more complex than that, and to appreciate some of its complexities may lead us to a rather different approach to the matter of recruitment.

Where are ministers likely to come from? It is one of the heartening things about the experience of the Church that the Spirit bloweth where it listeth, and that God sometimes raises up servants in the unlikeliest places. But in normal times not more than a small minority of ministers comes in this way, and the spiritual virtue of prudence and the humility not to tempt the Lord our God, forbid us to budget for more than a small number of such gifts. For the most part, ministers come from the existing churches and mainly from the devoted Christian families of those churches. Any policy for the recruitment of ministers must, therefore, be closely related to the size of the constituency from which they are drawn and a realistic assessment of the size of that which they are likely to have to serve. It must also be related to the competing claims of other spheres of service upon the allegiance of those who are possible recruits.

Here, three propositions can be laid down which few of us, I think, would be disposed to challenge. The first is this: the size of the real church is much smaller than the institutional structure it strives to maintain would suggest. This is much more true of the Church of England than it is of us, and confronts that church with a problem of the utmost gravity. Every parish wants its parish church and the parish church requires at least one parish priest, but where is the Christian community which is likely to produce one priest or more for every parish? But it is true enough of us also. We try to keep going a far larger number of churches than can maintain a minister or provide him, in themselves, with an adequate sphere of work. Our membership has declined more rapidly than the number of our churches. And that means that there are fewer people out of whose ranks ministers are likely to come. It may be that the quality of the commitment of those who remain in our churches is such that they are more likely to produce ministers than in the days when church-going was more conventional, but that consideration will have to be offset by our second and third propositions.

The second proposition is that the size of the real church is likely to become progressively smaller for some time to come. This is one of the points where a little social science might help us and I wish I could find an eager student who might be prepared to do a piece of research along these lines. The natural tendency of the rate of decline in an institution of the character of a church is accelerative. If large numbers of the members of a whole generation have been lost to the churches, and its membership is mainly composed of those of an older generation who remained loyal when their children went away, the likelihood is that as they die off the decline in church membership will become even more rapid. Of course, it will be qualified by all sorts of local variations and other factors, but most of us agree that this is broadly what had happened to our churches between the wars.

When this is borne in mind, the statistical situation of our churches today as compared with, say, 1939 is a good deal more hopeful than might at first appear. The fact that our rate of decline has markedly slowed down, despite the social upheaval of the war, and that the number of our Sunday School scholars and teachers has begun to rise, is a sign of real advance, for, as I say, the natural tendency would be for the rate of decline to increase as the old members die off. It means that new life is coming into our churches, not yet in such strength as to offset the effect of the processes of decline which set in long ago, but at least in a way which indicates that our churches are far from being under sentence of death.

All that is hopeful, but it does not affect the fact that for quite a long time to come the only reasonable assumption to make is that our churches are going to continue to become smaller. To indicate the scale of this, let me briefly mention these figures—in 1939 our churches in England and Wales, including the Union of Welsh Independents, had 416,000 members. In 1946 they had 371,000. In 1952 they had 341,000. If in 1962 they have more than 300,000 they will not have done so badly, and if they equal the 1952 figure they will have done remarkably well. It may well be that of those a larger proportion than in the recent past will be quite young people from whose ranks recruits to the ministry will be more readily drawn, but that will still not offset the fact that, as far as we have any right to suppose, for many years ministers will be called upon to minister to a greatly diminished and still slightly diminishing constituency.

The third proposition is that the number of other jobs which will attract a young man of the type who might enter the ministry is steadily increasing. Consider the full import of this. I am not only making the familiar point that whereas in the old days teaching and preaching and business were almost the only options for a lad of parts, especially from a Congregational household, nowadays he can get bursaries for higher education simply by reaching a certain not very high standard of proficiency, and then has almost any career open to him generally offering worldly prospects far superior to those of the ministry. Even for the young man of genuine Christian conviction, there are many other possible spheres of service which he may consider quite seriously as a Christian vocation, and which he may prefer to the ministry because he is dissatisfied with the way the life and work of the ministry are organized. He may feel that he can exercise pastoral gifts more effectively as a psychiatrist or a personnel manager, that he can witness to his faith in a more relevant manner in politics or journalism or education, that he can serve his fellows more readily as a Colonial servant than as a missionary. Or even if he undergoes theological training, a host of new jobs present themselves to him, such as teaching Scripture in schools or in college and so on, while, for the best of reasons, the army of specialists engaged in the wider work of the Church, who are not in pastoral charge, is for ever growing.

What is the upshot of this? If we insist on believing that the existing need of the churches or the existing number of places to be filled in our theological colleges are immutable we are likely to obtain the number of men we desire for the ministry at the expense of their quality. The policy becomes, in fact, one of dilution. The temptation to do this has not been acutely felt in the years since

the end of the war because of the large number of good men coming back after six years of war, but it is beginning to be seriously felt now. It is a temptation we should resolutely face and know how to meet. I want to show that it is a temptation we ought determinedly to resist, at whatever cost.

Let me first, however, try to clear away a possible source of misunderstanding. To speak of poor quality in ministers is not to speak from an academic point of view only nor to set a romantically high standard of moral and intellectual attainment. While it is of the utmost importance that a substantial proportion of ministers should be men of the highest academic competence, it is no less important that the chief gift of others should be in their ability to interpret the Gospel in terms of the experience of the less educated sections of the community. There is, of course, always a place for ministers of very limited educational background but who possess compensating gifts in other directions. It was a source of great strength in the Welsh ministry up to a generation ago—whether it is so still is another matter—that so many ministers came straight from mine or farm and remained in close touch with them throughout their college days and after. Nor is it implied that there is no place for the steady, faithful plodder who may have few obvious, superficial gifts, but who possesses true loyalty and devotion. Apart from anything else, there are not enough so-called first-rate men to go round in any profession. A friend of mine was staying with a bishop recently, and was impressed by the quality of one of the parish priests he met. He asked the bishop how many men whom he considered really on top of their jobs he had in his diocese. The bishop replied, "Ten per cent." My friend told this story to a retired Civil Servant of great eminence. He was surprised when the Civil Servant said, "Ten per cent! He's lucky. I wish I could say the same for government departments."

To speak about maintaining high standards of entry, therefore, is not to ask for the impossible. But, at the very least, we should certainly not lower our standards below those of the past as we may be tempted to do if the shortage becomes more acute. None of us is worthy of the great office of the ministry, and God in His mercy can use the unlikeliest instrument for His purpose of grace, but, as faithful stewards, have we the right to admit into our ministry those who are neurotic, bone-idle, of sub-normal intelligence, chronic sentimentalists, the rejects of other professions and other denominations, small-time careerists on the verge of middle age who are tired of their secular callings, and all the rest who apply hopefully for entry to theological colleges? Whether it is true or not that too many of such have been admitted in the past

what we ought to be clear about is that it is of peculiarly urgent importance that none shall be admitted in the future.

Why is it so peculiarly important at the present stage of our history? We all know that our churches, in common with others in England, are passing through an awkward period of transition. Our numbers, as I have said, are decreasing, and for some time to come will probably continue to decrease. Our population is very mobile and the pattern of national community life is altering. We have to do a great deal of internal reorganization. Buildings and churches will have to be closed down and re-located. Our ministry will have to take new forms and be sufficiently resourceful and adaptable to seek new opportunities. To expound the Gospel as true and relevant in terms of modern experience is a difficult and exacting task. There are the challenges and readjustments involved in schemes of reunion. All this is going to make heavy demands on the power of leadership of ministers. It is going to be made impossibly difficult if we allow too many men into our ministry who can neither give nor follow a responsible lead.

All that is clear enough, but consider something of the magnitude of the problem created for a Church by having to carry a large number of unsatisfactory ministers.

First, they are a financial burden on the competent. To put it with Scriptural bluntness—they are labourers not worthy of their hire. They do not earn their keep. I should be the last to suggest that, especially in these days, the state of the church accounts was a very reliable index of a minister's competence. Of course, all sorts of other factors enter in. But in facing the very grave financial problems which confront the Congregational ministry we have to reckon with the fact that one reason why people do not support the churches more is that they often have no confidence in their ministers. They do not want to throw good money after bad even in the Lord's service.

Secondly, they are a serious drag on the wheels of any schemes of reorganization. The man who is not sure of himself and his position will always play for safety. And he always finds it easier to stay in the old familiar rut than to venture into the unknown. The church which ought to be closed and to move out to the new suburb will be able to keep itself going because it can always find a minister of this type and such men will always be available because they are glad to get in anywhere and are rarely able to stay in one church for very long.

This is closely linked with the third point. They are a powerful influence for ecclesiastical and theological conservatism. This does not mean, of course, that they will be conservative in theology or churchmanship out of reasoned conviction. It means that they

will always cling to the familiar and the easily assimilated. Despite the best efforts of their tutors, their ideas are likely to remain all their lives the same as the vague notions which they held when they first considered the ministry, and they will always vote with the majority, unless their malady takes the form of always being 'agin the government.' This is a very real danger. There is little doubt, for example, that the growth of regimented intransigence among Anglo-Catholics in the Church of England is due to the fact that between the wars large numbers of men of limited education were taken into Anglo-Catholic seminaries and given a rudimentary training only in their own point of view, so that they can now think only according to the book and react defensively as soon as anyone confronts them with a new idea which does not fit in with their preconceived notions. Under the pressure of the changes which are bound to come to our ministry in the next generation, that could happen to us if we do not have a very careful policy of recruitment.

Two considerations which may appear to be objections come in here. The first is that our churches need more ministers, or at least, more ministry, than we are able to provide, and if it should happen that with an astringent policy of admissions fewer were forthcoming, what shall they do? The answer is that they would be compelled to face their situation more realistically. They would have to say to themselves, 'Since God has not seen fit to send us enough ministers who achieve even the minimum degree of ordinary competence, how can we the more effectively reorganize ourselves to meet this situation? Are we making the best use of what ministerial resources we have available? Do some of us have too luxurious a conception of what ministerial help we need?' These questions will be very much more easily faced and answered if our ministers, although few, are of a high quality and respected and able to take firm decisions. For example many are saying today that it is necessary and indeed desirable that lay people should share more fully in the work of ministry in the churches. Is not such a reform likely to be carried out more effectively if ministers can give real leadership and guidance to them, and if we are not hampered by the presence of ministers who are not highly regarded by the laity and who are fearful of the loss of prestige or position for themselves? And, for reasons which are not altogether discreditable, when ministers are few and good and hard to come by, people will be disposed to listen to them more, pay them better and be more attracted to the idea of joining their ranks. Dilution of labour may be possible in some jobs. It is a fatal policy in ours.

The other consideration is this. Are there not signs that there is a revival of the Church on the way? It has been said earlier that

although our churches are likely to go on declining in numbers for some time new life is beginning to flow through them. May we not hope that this new life will increase and with it the demand for the services of more and more ministers? We may indeed hope so, but this very fact is one of the strongest arguments of all in favour of a policy of great restraint in regard to recruitment for the ministry at present. For it is the experience of most revivals of the Church that when they come they break out in new directions and are often in tension with the existing organization of the churches. Can there be a greater handicap to a revived Church than a large number of ministers who are unable to respond to it, and who are, indeed, embarrassed by it because it expects more from them than they are able to give? It is significant that those places where the signs of revival are clearest, the Universities, for example, do not produce recruits for the ministry in anything like the numbers we might expect. The reason may well be that they are rightly suspicious of the existing set-up of the ministry. Surely, the possibility and the partial actuality of revival make it all the more imperative that we scrutinize with the utmost care every candidate we admit to the professional ministry.

If this thesis is accepted, there are two problems which immediately present themselves in the particular situation of Congregationalism.

The first is, if it should happen that the supply of ministers from the colleges does not meet the demand from the churches, will it not encourage churches to accept men as ministers who came in by the back door, without such benefits as a college training can confer on even the unlikeliest recruit? This is a difficult question, raising the further question of how much freedom of action churches should be entitled to in a matter like this. However this matter is dealt with I am sure it should not be made an excuse for a lax policy of recruitment.

The other is, of course, the position of our colleges. There can be no doubt that the superfluity of colleges in Congregationalism greatly increases the temptation to admit unsuitable men to the ministry in the present state of our affairs. Colleges want to justify their existence and without students they find it hard to do so. Principals and boards of governors would not be human if, in such a situation, they did not find themselves giving the benefit of the doubt to the man about whom they are not sure. I think the colleges have a clear duty to the future of our churches to argue resolutely the other way. This is not necessarily to say that we should bend our energies to closing some of our colleges. It could be argued, for example, that the influence of all our colleges in the church life of their neighbourhoods is so healthy that we need to keep them

all going. But if we do so, we cannot do so in the traditional way. They might well, in some instances, fulfil a most valuable function as centres of Christian education for the laity and for ministers needing refreshment. But it should be made perfectly clear by all the colleges to the denomination, and we may have full confidence in our Principals to do this in the most statesmanlike way, that they can take only as many candidates for the ministry of suitable quality as come forward, and that they betray their function if they fill up their places at any price. They should receive credit not so much for the number of men they have in training as for the number of men they refuse. And what goes for colleges goes even more for provincial committees.

This is the kind of quiet, unspectacular reform fully within the competence of the ministry itself which could do more to transform the character of Congregationalism than any number of glamorous and large-scale enterprises. We are very fortunate in the kind of leadership we have in these days in most of our colleges. If that leadership is exercised with a determined resolution to maintain the highest standard of entry to the ministry its influence will not become very quickly apparent, but over the years it could decisively alter the whole tone of our denomination. Nothing quenches the spirit of a church more than a bad ministry. And nothing is more creative even of further gifts of ministry than a good one.

MODERN PSYCHIATRY AND THE CHURCH'S HEALING MINISTRY

By Denis V. Martin, M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P., D.P.M.

The broad principles of dynamic psychology, with its emphasis on the importance of unconscious mental activity, the concepts of repression and conflict, and the tendency to project our inner difficulties on to others, are generally familiar, and much has been done to apply these concepts to the sphere of religion. Much less, however, has been written on the relevance of the principles of psychotherapy to both personal and corporate Church relationships.

I use the term 'psychotherapy' to cover any form of deep psychological treatment which aims at dealing with unconscious material, because the term 'psycho-analysis' is misleading, since it is a technical word for the method peculiar to the Freudians. There are a number of different schools of psychotherapy, Freudian, Jungian and Adlerian being the most widely known, but there are now others. All these schools differ in their theoretical standpoint, and to a lesser extent in their treatment techniques, but they all produce a fair proportion of successful treatment results. It seems reasonable, therefore, to suppose that notwithstanding these varying theoretical approaches to the neurotic patient there may well be one or more factors common to all, which account for the successful results which all achieve.

A careful examination of the different schools of psychotherapy does in fact reveal three main principles which all insist are essential to successful treatment:—

1. They all aim at uncovering, or bringing to consciousness, contents of the unconscious mind.

2. They all insist that intellectual understanding, or acceptance, of a new outlook or attitude is ineffectual unless accompanied by an emotional experience of such a change.

3. They all agree that the crucial factor in bringing about the above effects in the patient is the special nature of the relationship between the doctor and the patient, which technically is known as the transference relationship.

I believe that these findings of modern dynamic psychology are of crucial importance for the Church. I do not, however, believe that they constitute new knowledge for the Church, but are rather a re-statement in modern terms of facts which the Christian Church has always known, but which have been too frequently neglected in

modern times. Moreover, it seems to me that the loss of the effective use of these facts has been considerably responsible for her tendency, in increasing measure, to turn to psychology.

As I have already said it is the purpose of psychotherapy to bring to the patient's consciousness certain contents of his unconscious mind. Now the main characteristic of these unconscious contents is that they have been repressed because they are, in some important way, unacceptable, or frightening, to the conscious ideals and aims of the patient, or to his security in relation to others. A simple example to illustrate this characteristic of unconscious material is that of the child who is brought up in an atmosphere which condemns any show of temper. As a result his hostile feelings become repressed into the unconscious so that he no longer experiences them consciously as such. This happens because the expression of them threatens his security in his relationship with his parents—he will not be loved if he shows his temper. However, these feelings continue to operate in the unconscious and manifest themselves in neurotic symptoms such as morbid fears, or in personality traits such as a compulsive need to please everybody lest they think he is showing hostility and so come to reject him. Many other examples could be given; sexuality might be substituted for hostility in this example; or positive feelings, such as affection, may be repressed because they have been rejected in childhood. In this way, many different neurotic symptoms can be produced, and many common personality traits, which hamper our relationships with others, may be formed. Now, if psychotherapy is to be successful, a relationship must be created in which the patient comes to feel that it is safe to express these various feelings of which he has become afraid. He must be able to feel that an expression of love, hostility or sexuality, for example, will not in any way affect his relationship with the therapist, that these things will be accepted as part of him, will be understood in a sympathetic way. But doctors are human and consequently, in practice, the quality of the relationship varies and always falls short of the ideal. The transference relationship can best be described in terms of the attitude of the doctor towards the patient which is required if the right therapeutic relationship is to be built up successfully.

1. It is an attitude of readiness to accept whatever is found in the patient, however conventionally shocking or contrary to accepted moral principles this may happen to be.

It is only as the patient comes to feel that the doctor really is ready to accept him as he actually is that such tendencies as sexuality and aggressiveness can be fully expressed, or morbid fears and anxieties, of which the patient feels utterly ashamed, can be

brought into the light of day. If he feels that he will be condemned, criticized, or that the doctor may be hurt or shocked, then these things will remain repressed or, if conscious, will not be revealed to the therapist.

2. It is an attitude of sympathetic understanding based on a real awareness of the same kind of tendencies in the doctor himself.

It is possible for the doctor not to be shocked or critical and to refrain from moral judgment, only if he has himself realized and accepted the darker side of his own personality. It is for this reason that the psychoanalysts insist on the necessity of the doctor having a personal analysis as part of his training in psychotherapy. Through his own analysis the doctor attains to a degree of self-knowledge which makes it possible for him to accept what he finds in his patient without emotional shock or condemnation. He must be able to accept hostile, critical or unjust accusations from the patient without responding in a similar way.

3. It is an attitude of respect for truth as perceived by the patient, and not an attempt to impose his own ideas on to the patient. He must be as free as possible from pre-conceived ideas and ready-made solutions regarding the patient's problems. This can perhaps be summed up by saying that he must respect the patient's individuality, or personality, and realize that the only solution of real value to his patient is one that he discovers for himself. This does not necessarily mean that the doctor, if a Christian, should not put the Christian point of view, but rather that he should avoid any tendency to use the relationship to impose this point of view upon his patient.

Within the security of such a relationship deeper and deeper layers of the personality reveal themselves as the patient's resistances, based on fear of destroying the relationship, break down. He is enabled to face himself with increasing honesty, and in real co-operation with the doctor seek a solution to the problems which previously were hidden from him. At its best, this attitude of the doctor to his patient in psychotherapy has much in common with St. Paul's famous description of Christian charity in the *Epistle to the Corinthians*. It was seen to perfection in the life of Jesus, for example, in the way He dealt with the woman taken in adultery when others were condemning her, little realizing their own hidden desires; again, in His dealings with the rich young ruler whom He might well have persuaded to follow Him if He had not respected his individuality so completely, and in His acceptance of Zacchaeus, whom the people despised. 'I did not come to condemn the world, but to save it', said Jesus. Theoretically, therefore, it would seem that the Christian should be able to approach people in this spirit far more effectively than anyone else, but it would appear that very

often the doctor attains greater self-knowledge and sympathy with human frailty through analysis than the Christian does through his devotional life. The importance for the Church of the discovery of modern psychiatry, that such a relationship is the necessary condition, as far as our knowledge goes, for the healing of much illness, is too obvious to need further stress.

Consider now the second of the principles accepted by all schools of dynamic psychology, which is that they all insist that intellectual understanding, or acceptance, of a new outlook or attitude is ineffectual unless accompanied by an emotional experience of such a change. It is by no means uncommon for an intelligent patient to have read up his case before he comes for treatment. He may be able to give a correct summary of what he thinks are the main factors causing his own illness, and yet be no better. The reason for this is that although he has a correct intellectual understanding of his problems, there has been no accompanying emotional experience. An example may make this point clearer. Either by reading, or during the course of treatment a patient, who complains of fear of insanity which causes recurring panic, may come to see clearly that insanity symbolizes for him loss of control of his emotional life; he may further realize that it is repressed anger which, in this symbolic way, he fears may get out of control. Nevertheless, he gets no relief from this knowledge because it is only operating at the intellectual level; he does not feel the anger as a real emotional experience through which he must pass before he gets relief and control. Later, if treatment is successful, he will begin to feel this hostility arising in relation to the doctor; he will express it in some way, and talk about his fears which arise with the hostile feelings. In the relationship with the doctor he has an opportunity to bring these feelings into the open and experience them as real feelings, not merely as an intellectual hypothesis about his symptoms. He is then in a position, with the help of the doctor, to deal with these in a healthy way. This example deals with what we might call negative feelings, or bad feelings, such as anger. The same principle also applies to positive feelings such as love. Thus a man may come to see intellectually that he is denying expression of tender feeling towards his wife or children, and that this is the cause of his symptoms, but this alone does not help him until these feelings are actually felt and expressed and lived through. This principle operates also in the patient's attitude to the doctor. He may fully understand with his intellect that the doctor will receive any expression of criticism without condemnation, but this knowledge does not help him until he is prepared to go through the experience of fear of losing favour with the doctor by actually expressing his criticism openly and finding that it makes no difference to the relationship.

He then feels secure with the doctor, instead of just believing simply with his intellect that he is secure. This experience makes all the difference, and it is essentially an emotional experience.

The third principle is that all schools of dynamic psychology aim at uncovering, or bringing to consciousness, unconscious material. A patient complains of pain in his abdomen which he is convinced is cancer. The obvious way to cure this fear would seem to be to examine him thoroughly, take X-ray pictures and then explain to him the scientific evidence that he has no sign of cancer. However, we find that if we do this one of two things happens; either his fear of cancer remains as strong as ever, or it is replaced by a new fear of, perhaps, tuberculosis. Such patients have often been from one doctor to another and had all manner of investigations but are still no better. The reason for this is that the conscious fear of cancer is merely a symbol of an unconscious fear of something in the psychological or spiritual sphere, e.g. fear of punishment for forbidden sexual or aggressive tendencies, which are repressed, and must be brought to light and faced before any relief of the symptoms can be obtained. We must be careful, therefore, to distinguish what we might call 'counselling' from psychotherapy. 'Counselling,' which is really only another term for good advice, deals with the management of problems that are conscious to the patient; it leaves the unconscious tendencies unchanged. Psychotherapy aims at creating a relationship within which unconscious tendencies are allowed to rise into consciousness.

What light do these principles of psychotherapy throw upon religious experience and Church relationships? I should first make it clear that I am in no way advocating the practice of psychological treatment, as I have described it here, by the minister of religion. It is a dangerous procedure for anyone but the trained psychotherapist; rather I hope to show that our knowledge of such treatment has a contribution to make to the Church in her own spiritual approach to people in distress and sickness.

Firstly, I think that what we have learned about the relationship in psychotherapy throws a great deal of light upon the reason why so many people in spiritual distress consult the psychiatrist rather than the minister of religion, or the Christian layman. The modern man has come to feel that the main task of the Church is to condemn evil, to pass judgment, and since he cannot separate himself from the evil that is part of him, he feels that he will be condemned. We sometimes speak of condemning the sin but loving the sinner. In practice this almost inevitably leads to a relatively unconscious attitude that the individual feels as condemnation of himself. Jesus came, not to condemn us, but to draw us into a redemptive relationship with Himself; and this redemption of evil was based upon the

highest quality of love which found its ultimate expression in the Cross. We have already seen that, although operating at a very imperfect level, the relationship in psychotherapy has much in common with Christian love, and its effect is to give a man the courage to face the tendencies in himself which he feels as dangerous or evil. On its own level, this relationship is redemptive in the sense that a man does get a certain sense of forgiveness and freedom which is based, not on the doctor condoning evil, but on the patient accepting responsibility for it instead of trying to turn his back on it, and finding that the doctor accepts him, cares for him and helps him together with this evil. I am in no way suggesting that man can forgive sin, but rather that love has a redemptive quality, whenever it is given expression in relation to another person. It seems to me that, to a considerable extent, we, in the Church, are responsible for people feeling that the main concern of the Church is to condemn evil, because we preach morality rather than love, both in our lives and in the pulpit. Our emphasis is too much on the importance of attaining the Christian moral standard of behaviour, instead of on the redemptive nature of a relationship of love with God. Many Christians think of Christianity as the imitation of Christ, a task which is utterly impossible for the best of us, instead of seeing it as a relationship with a Person whose love is of such a quality that to experience it is to be redeemed and set free. The patient in real conflict has long since learned that he cannot overcome his problem just by trying to be different, by copying an ideal however inspiring. He needs an experience of love that will change him from within so that he becomes different. This is of the nature of a rebirth, of which the New Testament speaks so clearly, but of which many Christians seem to have no vital experience. No good psychotherapist tells his patients that they ought to do this or that, for he knows that they cannot until they have been changed inside themselves, within the security of the therapeutic relationship.

If we apply this aspect of the problem to corporate Church life we find that very often people do not enter our Churches because they feel they should be up to a certain conventional standard before they will be accepted; they do not feel that the Church is, in fact, a fellowship of love within which they are sure of a welcome, just as they are. If we believe that the Church is a fellowship based upon divine love, then it should differ fundamentally from other institutions in the quality of its relationships. We might well ask ourselves whether Church members give their love to the naturally unlovable, dull, critical, difficult, or shy members. If they do not, then the Church differs little in her relationships from the average social club. Or, again, are there cliques of like-minded, friendly people into whose circle it is difficult for the new member

to break, and is the average Church member concerned mainly with the quality of his relationship with others, or with the value of their relationship to him? We have to learn how we can create a fellowship of love that will issue in healing for the spiritual sickness of men and women, both physically and mentally. It would be interesting to illustrate this aspect from our experience of psychological treatment in groups, but here I confine myself to saying that successful treatment is dependent, in the final issue, on the creation of new group relationships, free from fear and suspicion. There seems to me to be a real danger of Church life and relationships being determined by conventional social standards based on a Christian ethic rather than on a living spirit of Christian love.

As the Body of Christ, the Church is the medium through which the redemptive love of God reaches men and women in need. We see in the New Testament how Jesus healed disease through His relationship with people as the incarnation of the love of God. This task He left to be carried on by the Church, and whilst healing prayer-groups are an essential part of this work, I want to stress the importance of the whole life of the Church as a healing fellowship of love, because I feel we are in danger of seeing the ministry of healing in too narrow a context. In the atmosphere of such a fellowship, people would surely find healing just as they do in the doctor-patient relationship. I recognize fully that many disorders are so complex that psychiatric help is essential as far as we can see at present, but the preventive value of such a fellowship would be tremendous, and much minor illness, at least, would be healed.

I have pointed out the importance of intellectual understanding being accompanied by an emotional experience if real change is to result. This principle has a clear counterpart in religious experience. Many people believe intellectually that God loves them, but in their hearts they fear Him more than they love Him. We doctors constantly find this to be true in Christian patients whom we treat for neurotic illness. A real experience of the love of God is a truly healing force, but to be effective it must be felt, not just believed intellectually; it must be a feeling-experience of the reality and utter reliability of the love of God. I have shown earlier that the relationship in psychotherapy is not effective so long as the patient merely believes that if he reveals the secrets of his mind he will be accepted and understood; he must act on that belief and express his feelings in some way and so experience the acceptance of the doctor. This is profoundly true in religious experience, and it would seem that the reality of God's love must be mediated to people through its expression by an individual Christian or through the fellowship of love which is the Church. Most people find is difficult to get a real experience of the reality of God's love just through prayer and

meditation; this would seem most commonly to be the result of relatively mature Christian experience; it is therefore of the utmost importance that individual Christians, and the Church as a whole, should be expressing the reality of God's love in ways that bring a real experience to those whose belief in God is, as yet, on a purely intellectual plane.

Lastly, we come to the application of the accepted principle of all schools of psychotherapy, that treatment must aim at uncovering, or bringing to consciousness, contents of the unconscious mind. From this important principle, too, we have something to learn regarding the devotional life. If people come to the Church, or to us as Christians, with their neurotic problems and illnesses, can we offer them guidance which will enable them, through this medium, to discover the truth about their deeper selves? To achieve this, any tendency to strengthen the repressive forces must be avoided, lest those tendencies and impulses which are unconscious, and cannot come to light, be pushed even deeper down where they will continue to set up disturbing symptoms and dissatisfactions. If the stress in the devotional life is too much on the attainment of goodness by self-control and discipline, by increasing the sense of God's disapproval of such tendencies as aggression and sex, the result tends to be that we become more frightened than ever of the darker side to our nature, or our self-condemnation is increased to a degree that we cannot tolerate, and so the moral forces increase the repression of these things, and the chances of getting them into the open and dealing with them grow less and less. We need to find some way of showing men and women how, in communion with God, it is safe, that is, will not alter God's attitude of love towards them, for them to bring their darkest thoughts to the light, knowing that He accepts them, and redeems them, so that a new spirit is born. To achieve this, we must ourselves be completely liberated from the legalistic view of God which sees His love as conditioned by our goodness or our behaviour; we must ourselves have a real experience of God's utterly reliable love for us just as we are, not when we are good or so long as we keep our darker side behind our backs as if it did not exist. The practice of meditation, at its best, achieves a real uncovering of the unconscious, but teaching regarding its practice is sadly neglected in our Churches today. The Saints passed through this experience of the unconscious when they spoke of the Dark Night of the Soul and similar experiences. Counterparts of such experiences are found in deep psychological analysis.

The consideration of modern psychological treatment may thus be of some value to the Church in the recovery of her healing ministry.

POLITICS AND MORALS

By E. L. Allen, M.A., Ph.D., D.D.

A lecturer, facing his audience with the announcement "My subject is 'Politics and Morals' " might well have been disconcerted by the audible comment from a member of the audience: "There's no connexion between the two!" Of course, he was not disconcerted, for it was precisely that prejudice he had set himself to overcome. I propose in this article to show that there is a genuine connexion between the two. At the outset, however, I intend to widen the gulf between them, and to postpone any bridge-building till later. But first let me explain that by politics I understand here those activities proper to the State and to groups, such as political parties, aiming at power within or over the State. The whole question of the relations between States is therefore passed over, as obviously calling for special treatment. Let me begin by analyzing political action into its component factors.

In the first place, all such action turns upon or is qualified by considerations of *interest*, and usually the interest of groups rather than of individuals. It should be clear by now that in a democratic society with the mass-population of our own—and it is with such I am here concerned—no party can hope to be returned to power unless it can appeal to some mass-interest. The decay of the Liberal party is due to loss in this sphere: in its hey-day, it had the backing of the industrialists who lived by our export trade and of the urban workers who demanded cheap food. The Independent Labour Party would have remained to this day a group of idealists with negligible representation in Parliament had it not consented to ally itself with the trade unions. Successive governments neglected agriculture till two world-wars forced upon us all the recognition that it is of prime national interest, and immediately it was taken into consideration.

In the second place, political action in a democracy makes frequent use of *compromise*. This is normally the convention that majority decisions will be accepted by all. There is nothing easier than to ridicule this convention. It is clear that wisdom does not reside with numbers, and others beside Ibsen have been tempted to maintain that "the damned compact majority" is always wrong. The mass of men can be extraordinarily blind even to their own interests. Nevertheless, the fact remains that there are two alternatives only to majority-rule, one being civil war and the other autocracy. Can there be any doubt which of these three courses

is to be preferred? Compromise runs through the whole functioning of democracy, from the resolutions the ward party sends up to the constituency executive to Cabinet decisions. Nor is it often the second best that is accepted under such circumstances; usually, it is something much farther from what one had wished for.

In the third place, it is not possible to eliminate from politics considerations of *power*. If power without a programme is wicked, programmes without power are futile. Wherever decisions have to be reached, even within the Church, there must be a final centre of authority, some one person or Assembly who has the right to say "Yes" or "No". A matter may be relegated to a committee, but with the understanding that should a deadlock arise, the chairman has power to resolve it by his casting-vote. Even where power is not overt, it may still be effective, as when a government quietly drops a measure that was in its election programme because it fears the effects it would have on industry. The modern State claims a monopoly of violence; it allows no one else to take life, while reserving to itself the right to do so. And short of that, it has a wide range of coercive measures at its disposal.

Interest, compromise, power—how repulsive these are! We are not surprised that some moralists would stigmatize as incurably evil the whole activity in which they have a part. For is it not axiomatic that good action must be entirely free from any suggestion of self-interest? Is not fidelity to principle one of the basic virtues? And is not the Christian pledged to employ persuasion and to repudiate coercion? Yet those who have had experience both of politics and of other types of activity assure us that the moral difficulties of the former are not always the more serious. Indeed, I would go so far as to say that while the emphasis so far laid on interest, compromise, and power as features of the political scene might be taken as implying a cynical attitude thereto, they can in fact be quite legitimately interpreted as expressions of the Christian spirit.

Everything here turns on what is appropriate to be made the occasion for political action and what is not appropriate. Experience on the Continent, and—to come nearer home—in Ireland, shows us that democratic politics are possible only as matters of conscience are excluded. Politics is the sphere of relative and not of absolute good. It is not by any means the whole of life and must be content to leave matters of most import to the home, the school, and the Church. Politics is the realm of goods of a lower order, of interest and not of principle. There will be occasion to modify this later, but let it stand meanwhile. Its restriction to this sphere is simply the recognition of the Christian and ethical wisdom of the lines,

How small, of all that human hearts endure,
That part which laws or kings can cause or cure.

The Whips may be put on when the mines are being nationalized, but not when the Prayer Book is being revised.

This being the case, compromise ceases to be the shabby thing it is often supposed to be and becomes the one reasonable method of dealing with relative goods. The terms of the National Health Service are best settled by bargaining with all the interested parties involved. An agreement reached in this way, after due consideration of all the facts, is more likely to stand than an imposed one. Further, is it not a requirement of Christian love that one should respect the judgment of another and seek to persuade him, bearing patiently the while with his misunderstanding and opposition? Does not humility require us to bear always in mind the possibility that the other may be justified in his point of view and that we should do well to meet him halfway? When a body with which you are working will agree to no more than ten per cent of what you want, is it more Christian to wash your hands of them than to accept the ten per cent and continue to work with them?

But power, you will say, is a very different proposition. What possible justification, from the Christian point of view, can there be in coercing a person to do something against his judgment? One answer is that where matters of interest are concerned we may suffer in our self-esteem by being coerced in this way, but no grave injustice is being done to us. Matters of conscience should, as has been maintained so far, be left to personal decision. Alas, the exigencies of modern life do not always allow for that, though even in time of grave national peril the State will be wise, as well as just, if it allows conscientious objection to military service. But a tragic situation may arise in which the individual conscience and the State cannot come to terms, and the first must suffer at the hands of the second. Here I would only say that in the long run it is all to the good that conscience should be required to prove its own claim by willingness to suffer.

We have seen, therefore, that a type of politics that is morally neutral because it does not aspire to be totalitarian, and recognizes that there is much in life too sensitive to be handled by its rough fingers, may be far more Christian than one that sets out expressly to translate Christian principles into legislation. Politics, it has often been said, is the art of the practicable; it is concerned with what *can* be done. And it is precisely as such that it can become a sphere of moral action. Let us consider how this is. A particular contingency arises and, by its structure, limits action to certain definite possibilities. We will call these *a*, *b* and *c*. The choice

between these will be determined by the standards one brings to the situation. Thus the Christian will see clearly that it is his duty to take the course *b* and reject the alternatives. Politics is the art of the practicable, but there are always several practicables and the choice between these is a moral one.

But we can go a step further than that. The Christian standpoint of the political leader will show itself, not merely in the choice between several technical possibilities, but in the earlier choice between several possible techniques. That there is a technical approach to human beings is too obvious to need arguing. Were it not so, what would be the point of the training of the minister and the teacher? Educational method is concerned with the right presentation of a subject to students at their various stages, with their differing backgrounds and capabilities. The individual is a moral subject, undoubtedly. But do we need anyone to tell us that he is also a complex of interests and prejudices, that he has his dislikes, his pet notions, and his biases, and that unless we take these into account we shall get nowhere with him?

But we see at once that there are limits here that may not be overstepped without injury to the individual as a moral subject. There is a line that separates education from propaganda. People have interests, no doubt, and we must study these and work *with* them. But we may not work *upon* them, that is, we may not corrupt and bribe people by exploiting their interests. They have prejudices, and therefore caution is advisable. We must make a detour to get round their prejudices; we may not surrender to them. They have their weaknesses, and, however little we like it, we shall have to flatter these somewhat. But we may not manipulate them for our own ends. In short, the only techniques of government and administration a Christian may accept are those which are consistent with respect for persons and can be utilized for moral purposes. This is the ground for claiming that, at our present stage of development, democracy is for us the most Christian form of government. We may not, of course, claim that it is such for all peoples and for all stages of political development. But our duty is concerned with what we have to maintain, and not with what we must get other peoples to do.

Let me illustrate what I said just now of Christian action in the sphere of politics. In our system, a civil servant remains at his post through successive administrations. When he is called upon to provide the information and advice necessary for a major political decision, he does so by outlining for the minister various courses of action with the consequences expected to follow from each. He finds that a Conservative minister will choose Plan A, a Liberal B, and a Socialist C. The fact that action has to be adjusted to certain

inescapable conditions does not prevent its being at the same time the expression of a moral attitude.

I have so far dealt with politics in terms of the three factors mentioned at the outset, interest, compromise, and power. But it is becoming clear by now that this is to limit the discussion unduly. We must recognize a fourth factor, what some would call an ideology but I would prefer to describe as *a faith*. Perhaps we can make a distinction here between the politician and the statesman. The former operates at the technical level, he knows how to manipulate public opinion and secure votes, the latter has a vision of some extensive and far-reaching good he is set to serve. The statesman has ideals, standards, and purposes in the light of which he selects between the means at his disposal. He knows what he wants to do and he knows, equally clearly, what in no circumstances would he be willing to do. It may be that the statesman needs to have something also of the politician in him, but he does not allow it to master him.

Two names suggest themselves at once as illustrative of this crucial distinction. Mussolini is the politician and demagogue, Lincoln the statesman and democratic leader. Mussolini aimed at power for his own ends, his ambitions were actually personal and only by pretext national, and he employed without scruple all the arts of cajolery, bribery, and coercion. In his heart he despised his fellows and regarded them as mere instruments. It is said that after haranguing a crowd from his balcony, he would return into the room and sink into a chair, laughing at the folly of the multitude whose cheers were still in his ears. Lincoln, on the other hand, sought power only that he might dedicate it to high ends. He was the servant of freedom and of the unity of his people. He was willing to accept the fearful responsibility of office, but he did so in humility. He made the compromises that were necessary, but without swerving from his final objective. He had faith in the people over whom he was set, he could appeal to their sense of honour and justice because he was one of themselves, and he sought to govern through them rather than over them.

Such a man transcends the limits of politics and comes forward as a moral leader. His work is not to be described any longer in terms of interest, compromise, and power, for he calls moral forces into operation. When he takes some critical political decision, he does so in the name of considerations that are more than political. One might instance the resolve of the Belgian government in 1914 not to allow passage to the German armies. Or again, when Great Britain transferred power to the new India and Pakistan, there was in that something of expediency, the recognition that the old state of things could no longer be maintained, but was there not

also a moral quality in it? The abiding political achievements are the work of forces that are not all purely political.

There is, of course, the other side to the picture. The mere possession of a high degree of moral insight and purpose does not qualify for the exercise of political responsibility. There is a technical aspect to politics as there is to engineering or, to come closer, to education. In these matters, virtue is not enough; efficiency is also needed and, indeed, in certain circumstances, may be the more important of the two. The good intentions of a teacher are no compensation for ignorance of the subject or for inability to keep discipline. The man who is needed in politics is the man who understands the methods by which great masses of men can be brought to consent to a policy, but who subdues these methods to an ultimate moral purpose. And such a man when he sees that he can no longer do that, because interest and prejudice stand stubbornly in his way, will have the courage to resign, though he will never do so lightly.

I come now to the thesis of "moral man and immoral society". If by this is meant that the actions of an organized group are, and perhaps must be, morally inferior to those of the individuals who compose it, the answer seems to be that there is no such connexion between the scale of conduct and its quality. The contention is made plausible only by resort to the fallacy of comparing the best in individuals with the worst in groups. For one who has no such initial prejudice, it might appear that groups are sometimes capable of greater restraint than individuals. Thus it is arguable that few individuals, placed as the Western powers were by the Berlin blockade, or as Britain was by the expulsion of the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. from Persia, would have been as patient under insult. Nor is it certain that many persons in similar circumstances would have controlled their power as Britain did when she respected the neutrality of Eire in the darkest days of the recent war.

Two positions need to be rejected as mistaken. The first is that the nation, or, to speak more exactly, the national representative and leader, is not under the moral law. The second is that the moral law for him in his official capacity is simply identical with what it is for him as a private individual. The duties of a representative, be he the father of a family or the head of a business, are related to his position and its specific responsibilities. Moral decision is often difficult for him, as it is for the individual. He must feel his way forward through doubt and uncertainty, he must take hazardous decisions and will be left with agonizing regrets as he looks back and thinks what else he might have done. The statesman has to balance the claims of his own nation against those of others, and the claims of the future against the present. He has

to consider public opinion and to draw upon his own special knowledge, and in the last resort to do as conscience directs. But do we not all have to act so?

It is sometimes claimed that the statesman is justified in doing for his country what as a private person he would never do. While we reject any such claim, we need to understand why it is put forward. I take as an illustration the case of Sir Stafford Cripps who, it is said, did as Chancellor of the Exchequer what he would not have done in his personal capacity when he denied that he intended to devalue the pound sterling long after he had made up his mind to do so. I would analyze the situation differently. There are certain marginal situations in private life in which we would do what otherwise would be repugnant to us, as when a man of honour, living under a totalitarian régime, tells a lie to conceal the whereabouts of a friend. Now there are just such situations in national life, perhaps indeed they are more frequent there. Rightly or wrongly, Sir Stafford Cripps thought himself to have arrived at one of these. He acted therefore as he would have done in private life under equally exceptional circumstances.

I do not deny that there is often an appreciable difference in level between the conduct of groups and that of individuals. I am only concerned to deny that this is some natural consequence of their being groups, and to urge that it is due to the failure of individuals to accept responsibility for the conduct of groups of which they are members. As I have said, what is deepest and highest in human life is beyond the reach of organization; it is an affair of personal insight, faith, and resolution. These things are only potent in organized groups as we who form those groups take them into them in the way I have outlined above in speaking of the statesman's faith and the consequences it has for his actions. The moral level of a group is low or high according as individuals do not or do take its affairs up into their own moral life.

Perhaps, in conclusion, it would be well to revert to the problem of power, which is, of course, the crucial one. There are three safeguards against the abuse of power by those who wield it, and we have granted that no modern State can dispense with some holders or holder of power. The first safeguard is *decentralization*. Power exists in a variety of forms, of which the most important are political, military, economic, and ideological. One of the elementary precautions for safeguarding liberty is to prevent the concentration of these four types of power in the same set of hands. Thus, it is essential that the military power be subject to civilian control in the last resort. Where what men can earn and what they can think are decided from the same point, the chances that liberty will survive are slight indeed. We can be free under two conflicting authorities, but not under one all-controlling authority.

The second safeguard is *law*. The holder of power must recognize that there is, independently of him, a code of rules as to how power may be exercised. He may act only within the limits laid down by this. If he finds it necessary to do more, he must seek permission first from the legislature. The efficacy of this safeguard is, of course, no more absolute than the preceding one. The would-be dictator will get a packed legislature to suspend its own authority and vote him special powers, as he will find ways and means to bring the army, industry, and the press under his control. And law is, in a sense, the crystallization of power-relations in the past. As such, it may be fraught with grave injustice and show partiality to a class against the general good. Therefore it has always been necessary to appeal from positive law to natural law, from human law to divine law.

So we come to the third safeguard, which is *conscience*. We have no final defence of liberty in any institution, for all institutions can be bent to the will of unscrupulous men. To him who has no scruples all evil is permissible. We are driven again to the conclusion that, while politics has its own laws, those laws must function within a moral universe, that, while it is to a large extent the techniques of handling mass-populations and securing results, those techniques must be subordinated to moral standards. Only he who does not regard power as itself conferring rights is qualified to exercise power. But no moral restraint upon power will be effective if it is confined to the holder of power. His temptations will be too severe. There must be a widespread and vigilant sense in the community that all power is under God and may only be exercised as His will of righteousness requires.

Yet a moment may come in a statesman's life when he must incur the suspicion of abusing power, even while his conscience is clear. He must act from knowledge he alone possesses or that he can share only with a very few. He must take a step that appears tyrannical and provokes resentment, yet that he is convinced is for the public good. He acts as conscience requires, knowing that he is accountable to those who will bear the consequences of his acts, and trusting that the outcome of his decision will show that it was justified. It is a test of the moral resources of a nation whether it can live through such a time as that, and it can do so only as it has confidence that those who are over it acknowledge, whether they use His name or not, that they are under God.

RETURN OF TYPOLOGY?

By E. C. Blackman, M.A., B.D.

There are many signs of a new interest in the Bible. And this is not merely in its best-selling appeal, nor its purely literary qualities, but in the Bible as the Church's text-book or marching orders; that is to say, in its essential authority. At a time when people are saying, Who will show us any good?, and feeling a new urgency about the basic authorities of life as contrasted with imposed authorities of bureaucracy or ideology, Christians are coming to realize that for them such authority is to be sought in the Bible. We hear of church-groups getting down to Bible-study. The British Council of Churches has a Bible-Weeks Committee, and has issued a statement of plans for an autumn and winter campaign to bring the Bible message to the present generation. In a recent number of this journal Principal Cunliffe-Jones wrote forthrightly on the meaning of the four Gospels, having in mind the need of the ordinary church member to be able to find for himself the presence of God in Jesus. Even Roman Catholics, with their much stronger tradition of veneration for the authority of the Church, seem to be turning to the Scriptures, as witness the beautiful translation of Monsignor Ronald Knox, as well as works of more academic scholarship.

The Fundamentalists are still with us, in a minority no doubt, though an increasing one, and certainly a powerful and eloquent one. It is to be hoped that the non-Fundamentalist Christian will take his Bible as seriously as his literalist brother, and handle it with understanding as God's Word for today and for him. To guide him in this, and as he seeks "to view my Saviour there," comes the present revival of typology, professing to avoid the Scylla of literalism on the one hand and the Charybdis of liberalism on the other, and to pilot him through to those safe waters where "the Redeemer's welcome voice spreads heavenly peace around."

Typology is an unfamiliar word, and its meaning is not absolutely definite even within professional religious circles. No theological student since 1920 has been required for examination purposes to read a book about it, and possibly no book under that title has appeared in the present century. It may be true that in Macaulay's time it was part of what every theological schoolboy knew, but that can hardly be assumed today. Roughly speaking it may be said that as the modern critical approach to the Bible

came in typology went out. But there are signs of its coming back.

Typology means the belief that certain persons or events in Biblical history have been types or foreshadowings of Christ. It starts with the authority of no less a person than St. Paul, who in one reference to the way in which the Israelites fell from grace and received condign punishment comments "these things were our examples" (more literally, with R. V. margin: "in these things they became figures of us.") *I Cor.* x, 6. Whether we say "examples" or "figures," or even "warnings" with the American revisers, the Greek word Paul uses is "types". A little later he adds "these things happened to them by way of example", and his Greek word is literally "typically", from the same root. His meaning is clear enough, for all the Rabbinical subtlety of his method of quoting Scripture: Christians are not to copy the example of the ancient Israelites in this matter. But there is more to it than that. Paul does not turn to history, as many ancient historians did, for its moral lessons. There was in his view a real correspondence between the Christians of his day and the Hebrews of Moses' day, for both alike were in communion with Christ. We may find it difficult to agree with him here, but the assertion in verse 4, "the rock was Christ", can mean no less. That is undoubtedly Paul's point, and this is the point of his typology, and there is more in it than moralizing with reference to famous episodes of history. This is not all that could be made of typology —the trump cards were not to be played until the second century— but it was definitely a step in that direction. The method is taken further in the *Epistle to the Hebrews,* where indeed it is integral to the author's main thought.

With this foothold in the New Testament, typology was developed as a distinctively Christian use of the Old Testament, and by the second century it was in full swing. Justin Martyr (c. 150 A.D.), in his Dialogue with the Jew Trypho, discerns a correspondence between Christians and Noah in the matter of salvation: "righteous Noah, with the other mortals at the deluge . . . . were a symbol of the eighth day, wherein Christ appeared when He rose from the dead. For Christ . . . . became again the chief of another race, regenerated by Himself through water and faith and wood, containing the mystery of the Cross, even as Noah was saved by wood when he rode over the waters with his household." Putting it more succinctly we may say Justin draws a parallel between the water of the Deluge and Christian baptism, and again between the Ark and the Cross. There is much more of this in Justin. As types of the Cross he mentions elsewhere the roasted Passover lamb (ch. 40), Moses with both hands outstretched as he prayed for victory over Amalek (ch. 90), and the

staves of Moses, Aaron, and Jacob respectively (ch. 86). Dean Farrar, in his book *History of Interpretation*, remarks somewhat contemptuously about this kind of treatment of the Old Testament that any piece of wood was liable to be called a type of the Cross! The prominence Justin gives to the Cross was not due only to its centrality for Christian faith, but also to the fact that the Jews found it particularly difficult to believe in a crucified Messiah: "We cannot bring ourselves even to think of this," says Trypho. More generally, Justin was concerned to find prefigurations of the Church and its distinction from Judaism: Leah, for example, stands for the Jews, and her weak eyes for Jewish inability to understand; her sister Rachel, the more desirable wife, is obviously the future Christians. On these principles—or lack of principles—anything can be made suggestive of things good or bad in Christian experience, and we are not at all surprised to read, "Jacob served Laban for speckled and many-spotted sheep; and Christ served even to the slavery of the Cross, for the various and many-formed races of mankind" . . . . "As Christ is the Israel and the Jacob even so we, who have been quarried out from the belly of Christ, are the true Israelite race" (ch. 134-5). For a parallel to I *Cor.* x. 4, with its reference to the spiritual rock which was Christ, we have His identification with the burning bush out of which God spake to Moses. That is chap. 127, an argument for Christ's pre-existence; in chap. 114 there is the simple statement that Christ is often called a stone in parable. In spite of all this extravaganza, which it is easy to ridicule, we must keep patient, bearing in mind the seriousness of Justin's conviction that "what the prophets said and did they veiled by parables and types . . . . they concealed the truth by these means, that those who are eager to find out and learn it might do so with much labour." There is here implied a doctrine of God's providential education of man, of *praeparatio evangelica,* preparation for the full revelation of the Gospel which is the climax of God's gracious dealing with man. And it is connected with the doctrine of the Holy Spirit active in men's minds before the advent of Christ as the final Revealer, preparing the receptive for the revelation as far as they were able. Justin is not very clear about this, and it was long before the Church had a proper doctrine of the Holy Spirit. But he is on the right lines when he writes "the Holy Spirit sometimes brought about that something which was the type of the future should be done clearly; sometimes He uttered words about what was to take place, as if it was then taking place, or had taken place" (chap. 114). The New Testament had of course begun this development of thinking about the Spirit (cf. I *Peter* i, 10-12).

We have referred to Justin at some length, not because he is

the outstanding Christian of the second century, but because he is the first in whom we can see this typological thinking fully developed. Its tendency to wander far beyond the limits of reasonable interpretation is patent. But we can also note that it has at its heart a conviction about God's action in history culminating in the Incarnation, which Christian theology can never give up. It badly needs a worthier dress, but the body of the conviction is there.

We pass on to refer more briefly to Irenaeus (c. 180 A.D.) and to Origen, who belongs to a higher class than either Justin or Irenaeus, before we come to consider a reasonable modern attitude to typology.

Irenaeus, who was nothing if not orthodox, claims our attention for two reasons. He marked out the way the Church was to walk, refusing the seductions of heretics to the right hand or to the left. He was, as Vernon Bartlet used to teach, the pioneer of central Catholicism. Secondly, Irenaeus was essentially an interpreter of Scripture. In reaction from heretics he repudiated fanciful exegesis. His instinct for what was sound theologically was of the greatest possible value to the Church at that critical juncture. It is all the more significant that he retains typology. A sad mis-judgment, you may think; surely the reasonable course in view of the ridiculous lengths to which some heretics had carried typology would have been to abandon the method altogether. That would be to go too far. We need to discipline ourselves to be patient in understanding the limited possibilities that were open to a Christian of the second century, however intellectually gifted. It was actually impossible for the Church then to make sense of the Old Testament without using the typological method. The one outstanding teacher who did discard it, the "eminent nonconformist divine" Marcion, discarded the whole of the Old Testament as well. That was the logical consequence, and we should not fail to observe it.

Very few Christians in the time of Irenaeus had any Jewish background. They accepted it as *de fide* that the Old Testament was the sacred book of the people to whom God had vouchsafed His revelations and of whom the Saviour Christ had been born. That sacred book therefore must be retained, and even if at first reading many passages had no clear religious or moral meaning they must nevertheless somehow be made intelligible. This was the imperative exegetical problem which Irenaeus had to deal with. Critics of the "immoral" passages were not unknown. It must suffice here to quote one significant passage: "With respect to those misdeeds for which the Scriptures themselves blame the patriarchs and prophets, we ought not to inveigh against them. . . . With respect to those actions on which the Scriptures pass no

censure (Irenaeus has in mind the incest of Lot's daughters) we ought not to become the accusers . . . . but *we should search for a type*. For not one of those things which have been set down in Scripture without being condemned is without significance."[1] Typology therefore seemed indispensable and legitimate. Marcion's solution was merely a cutting of the knot; it dissolved the true Christ into a theory.

We pass to Origen and into the next century. Origen's overriding importance as a dogmatic and also as a Biblical theologian makes him worthy of fuller treatment than either Justin or Irenaeus, but there is no space for that here. It was he who established allegorical exegesis in the Church, and laid down that distinction of the three senses of Scripture which was to play so large a part in interpretation down to the time of the Reformers. Our sole purpose in referring to him in this article is to note the contrast made by Daniélou, in his recent very fine exposition of Origen,[2] between typology and allegory in Origen's work: typology being the distinctively Christian treatment of the Old Testament, while allegory was a pagan importation, originally Greek and applied to the Bible by the Jewish scholar Philo just before the time of Christ. The distinction is illuminating and fair enough, though it may be doubted whether it was as clear to Origen as it is to Père Daniélou. The problem it raises for us is whether we accept typology as a definitely Christian usage which should be kept up. Two propositions may be made: (1) A natural first reaction to typology, whether distinguished from allegory or included in it, is *non tali auxilio!* The extravagances which have just been illustrated sufficiently out of Justin, and to which Origen saw no more objection than did Justin and Irenaeus, are not possible for us. But the basic presupposition of typology, that the Old Testament points forward to Christ, can and must be maintained. Our way of doing this is in terms of the understanding of the central theme of the Bible as the progressive revelation of God's saving purpose in mighty acts interpreted by faith and culminating in Jesus Christ. With that we are overlapping our second proposition, (2) that typology is best understood as an understanding of history—more strictly of the divine control of history—rather than as a method of Biblical interpretation. This suggestion is derived from a remark of Florovsky's in the recent important composite work *Biblical Authority for Today* (p. 175), contrasting allegory as exegesis of texts with typology as interpretation of events.

Typology then is to be retained as an expression of the faith that history is under God's control, and that certain events are

1 Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, Book IV, ch. 31.
2 J. Danielou, *Origène* (1948), pp. 137-198.

more specifically foreshadowings of the same divine energy which motivated Christ (*Eph.* 1, 19). This is central Biblical faith and merits our constant attention as worshippers and as intelligent Christians in the modern world. It is not at all a matter of the manipulation of O. T. texts or the forced discernment of parallels between O. T. figures and Christ. We must refuse to have part in that fascinating but fruitless exercise; in other words, we must not make of typology an exegetical technique. If pursued in that sense it is not distinguishable from allegory, and is exposed to all the criticisms which have made allegory out of date.

We notice the influence of this definition of typology in an article by Professor Lampe of Birmingham in a recent number of *Theology* (June 1953), from which we quote two significant passages: "The typological method of exegesis when properly applied is essentially the recognition in our interpretation of Scripture of its character as the record of the continuous progress of the acts of God. In the light of their climax in the Christian revelation we can begin to discern, with the New Testament writers themselves, the pattern of that record, and the function of typology is to trace that pattern. . . . It is primarily a method of historical interpretation. . . . It seeks to demonstrate the correspondence between the various stages in the fulfilment of that purpose" (p. 202). "It is extremely difficult to distinguish between legitimate and illegitimate typology. The early Church failed to establish a criterion, badly as it needed one. The quest for a criterion is again confronting us as a most urgent task. . . . Typology should be a by-product of the Biblical theology of history, a mode of interpretation based on the conviction that with all its diversity of authors, historical background and theological understanding, the Bible has a single unifying theme. All too often it has been confused with, and passed over into, allegory; and allegory is founded upon a disregard of history. It ignores the true nature of the Scriptural records. . . . Legitimate typology rests upon an historical foundation; allegory upon a quasi-Platonist view which sees the literal record of events as but a phenomenal husk which contains within itself eternal truths" (p. 205). In other words, Prof. Lampe wants to bring typology definitely into the service of Biblical theology, and with that we heartily concur. There is a future for it in that livery. Critical study of the Bible has resulted in much new insight into its meaning, and this urgently waits to be preached and brought to the serious attention of church members as well as to the multitudes of honest enquirers who are not in the churches, but are in the sixth forms of schools and among the readers of periodicals. They have not yet had presented to them the majestic message of the kingly love of God which is the central theme of the Bible;

the idea of Covenant which is central in the Old Testament, and that of the Kingdom which is central in the New Testament. The Bible can and must be made 'to come alive' round these great central themes. Sir Charles Marston thought it could come alive round archaeology; the Fundamentalists welcomed that and made it part of their claim for the literal emphasis as the only means of making the Bible live. Surely there is far greater hope if the new Biblical theology made available by critical study is clearly and confidently taught.

That is the responsibility of preachers and teachers. Its discharge will result in the equipment of the church member so that he can handle the Bible intelligently as a modern man, with proper realization of its uniqueness as literature and of its authority to claim his intellectual allegiance and to guide his daily living. The Bible's intrinsic authority when once perceived is gladly accepted. It is not an authority conferred on it by the Church. The majority of Christians have been content with that conception of Biblical authority, and many still are. Brought up to regard the Bible as 'the best book', 'God's Word', 'Holy Scripture' rather than simply Scripture, they accept that evaluation and pay lip service to it and would be horrified at any slighting of it. We should expect more than this from our church members, and our preaching and training of members in this generation must help them just here. Principal Cunliffe-Jones in his article mentioned earlier drew attention to this and outlined methods with reference to reading of the Gospels. A parallel with the much discussed happenings in Berlin last June may be pertinent. As we have seen in East Germany the authority of a government may be accepted, but still remain an imposed authority, which the majority, though giving no inner consent, are forced to acknowledge. As long as a government exercises a merely bureaucratic power in this way its authority is not of the highest order; it depends on force, not on the consent of the population. This rough comparison may serve to illustrate our problem in the churches of getting clearer understanding of the Bible's intrinsic authority. Its recognition as the norm of belief and conduct was unquestioned in previous centuries, but now, since the acceptance of modern critical views, needs to be re-asserted and clarified. The ordinary Christian is not able to take up his Bible with this joyful sense of its power to speak to his need with an authority as of God which he can thankfully accept. The Bible has not been made 'alive' to him in this sense, and he has the right to call on his spiritual masters and pastors for help, and that right early.

TOWARDS A REBORN CONGREGATIONALISM

By B. C. Plowright, B.A., B.D.

At the beginning of the sixteenth century the Roman Church, authoritarian to its very core, found itself confronted with a world which was agog for freedom. The tide of liberty had been gathering weight and speed for two centuries, and by the turn of the century it had become irresistible. To that demand for freedom the Roman Church returned a direct "No"; it declared that it could give no reply save in terms of its own authoritarian tradition, and, for the time being, it became an ecclesiastical Mrs. Partington trying to sweep back the tide with a broom.

The Church of Christ today faces a like situation. For almost two centuries the forces that demand justice have been mounting, and now the sound thereof is a mighty, world-wide roar. Now, as then, nations clamour for their freedom and, just as behind the nationalism of the sixteenth century there was the determination of the burgher classes to be free, so behind the nationalism of our time lies the determination of the workers to secure justice. And, at bottom, the cry for justice is the cry for freedom, the demand to be treated as a person and not as a thing to be moved hither and thither at the behest of some other person or group.

The demand for justice raises important new issues for both Church and State, and the chief of them is focused in the question, Who will see that justice is done? In view of recent history, it seems sheer folly to those who cry for justice to trust to the benevolence of employers, or to the working of some inherent but invisible law of pre-established harmony in the universe. There is only one power which can see that justice is done, and that is the State. Therefore the State must plan, and its plans must have the force of law. We shall have to live with a State which wields far more authority than formerly.

Our position then is basically the same as that of the Roman Church in the sixteenth century, but in reverse. That Church was asked to redeem a world in which, perforce, authority had to make room for freedom; we are asked to live redemptively in a world which must make room for authority alongside its freedom. And since no crisis can be redeemed unless the Church gives the answer to the central problem in its own life and organization, churches for whom freedom is their life-blood must perforce take into their

freedom an authority they have not known. The price of refusing to do so is the price that the Roman Church paid in the sixteenth and succeeding centuries—the forfeiture of the power to say the redeeming Word of God to its own generation.

Disquieting signs are not wanting that we are in fact treading exactly the same road that Rome trod four hundred years ago and that we too, like Mrs. Partington, are trying to keep the tide out with a broom.

Our judgment on our contemporary world is startlingly like that of the Roman Church then. To us, it is a situation in which pride and materialism, forgetfulness of God and practical atheism, moral and cultural decay are characteristic. It seemed so then. For us, authority seems a deadly poison which can only end by destroying freedom; for them freedom seemed wholly incompatible with authority. The threat inherent in freedom coloured all their thinking and their practical reaction to the situation; where we cry, "Freedom in danger", they cried, "Authority in danger". They tightened up the ecclesiastical organization, and clarified the Faith in the Council of Trent. We have sought to make clearer to our people what is the essential nature of classical Congregationalism, and there are signs[1] that seem to suggest that we, too, are looking for some bulwark against disintegration in closer organization from the top downwards! The Roman Church used the Orders to further the evangelization of the local neighbourhood; to that, too, we trust. We are in fact keeping ghostly step with the then Roman Church. Our interpretations of the situation, our reactions to it, the domination of our thought and life by the threat of the situation, and our consequent blindness to the full redemptive possibilities of the situation and our proposals for meeting the situation, are in no way different from theirs. There is in fact scarcely a mistaken method which the Roman Church adopted then which we are not adopting now; hardly a judgment which we do not echo, and almost no fond, illusory hope which they nursed which we do not ourselves entertain.

Two reflections are inevitable, and the first is obvious. If Rome with its magnificent organization and its unrivalled command of vast resources, both material and spiritual, found that none of these things, nor all of them together, could avail to enable it to become a creative force in the next three hundred years, we are at least equally likely to find them as totally inadequate.

The second reflection cuts far deeper. It is that in doing all that it did Rome honestly believed it was doing the will of God; and because it believed it was doing precisely that, it brought to its task an untiring zeal and a genuine evangelistic concern. Yet

1 For example, the appointment of the Structure and Administration Committee in the first instance, and now its re-appointment.

evangelical zeal and a real concern for the souls of men were as unavailing as was closer definition of creed or completer organization to catch the ear and command the loyalty of the men of that time, or most important of all, to win them for saving faith in Jesus Christ. What the Church said was rendered impotent by what it was. It oozed authority at every point. Worship, faith, life and organization all conjugated the verb "Thou shalt", and that temper and that organization were alien to a generation which had already begun to read its Bible and was beginning to claim the right to understand and interpret for itself what there was written. Hence sprang the great irony and paradox of the Reformation—a great Church, which wished to save men, could not save them because of the pattern of its own life and organization, and just when it believed most sincerely that it was saying "Yes" to God, it was, in fact, saying "No". It could not conjugate the Gospel save in terms of its own tradition nor speak the Gospel in any other accents than those to which it was accustomed, and because it could not do so, God, whose redemptive purpose for the world abides for ever, had to create a new body for himself; a new people of God, the Protestant and Puritan communions.

The final test which has to be applied to church life is the test of redemptive history. If venerable tradition, close organization and clearly defined creed could have saved any communion they would have saved the Roman Church.

What is at stake here is not bare, continued existence, but continued existence as the people of God, saying the redemptive word to its own day and living it out in its own life. Churches can continue to be by speaking only to the private need of individuals; what they cannot do is to speak that living word to the public need of men which alone is potent to create the true and lasting revival. In a special way such Churches come under the judgment of God, and the indictment is that they have saved the few where they might have saved the many. Some years ago a ship was lost at sea by fire, and some of the crew and passengers were brought home by a passing steamer. There was naturally great rejoicing and much praise for the rescuers, until the official enquiry was opened and the captain's attention was drawn to two entries in the ship's log, "12.5 a.m. glare seen" and "2.17 altered course"; and he had no satisfactory answer when asked why he had delayed two hours to make for the burning ship. He was severely censured on the ground that if he had altered course earlier he could have saved the great majority of the ship's company and passengers, but had saved only the few. And that same judgment of "needless loss of life" falls upon all churches which, in the hour of the world's bitter need,

refuse that rebirth which alone can enable them to discharge the unending task of the Church, the task of "redeeming the time".

In all this we have been brought to the Johannine insistence that when the "time", the crisis, arrives in the affairs of men the first thing that has to happen is that the people of God must be reborn. Christ's word to Nicodemus is clearly not a word to the individual, but to him as representing, perhaps in some unofficial sort of way, the religious authorities, "*We* know. . ." "*Ye* must be born again" are conclusive. It is that issue which faces Congregationalism. We have been amongst the foremost to plead for restatement of the Gospel in modern terms, and the need of constant reform of the Church with us is axiomatic. We have to learn to say "rebirth" with an understanding of the deep and drastic significance of what we mean when we use the term. It means nothing less than the emergence of a new Congregationalism with a new pattern of life. Anything less than that is vain, and to imagine that we can survive as a people of God by closer organization, clearer apprehension of our faith and zealous individualistic evangelism is to stuff our ears with cotton wool under the delusion that it is the latest and most efficient form of deaf-aid apparatus; to adapt a nautical phrase, it is to steer 'by guess' but not 'by God'. Classical Congregationalism, geared as it is to freedom, has little to say to modern men who know that there can be neither true individuals nor true communities unless the blood stream of freedom flows easily in the hard bony anatomy of authority. When we talk so often of freedom being in danger, we do but convince the world that we have not even begun to fathom the real depth of the crisis of our times, and that the mental world in which we live is that of the seventeenth century. The world has little use for churches which busy themselves with 'watering last year's crop'.

What is stated here is not, as it might appear to be, a matter of determinism in the spiritual sphere. It is not being said that public needs determine spiritual responses; and the mere fact that, as we have already shewn, a Church does not of necessity make the true response, points the way to the real statement of the case. It is primarily a matter of obedience to God, of humble acceptance of His call to us to redeem our own time, and of willingness to be reborn in order that we may do that very thing.

The fate which overtook the Roman Church in the sixteenth century should be warning grave enough to prevent us offering to God for His use in our crisis an '-ism' with its ingrained habits of thought and its fixed and customary ways of action. That way lies sterility and, for so small and relatively unorganized a communion as Congregationalism, it probably means death. We cannot fit God into our denominational patterns; we can only offer ourselves for

His use without any reservations as to what happens to our patterns. God is the fixed and unalterable point, not we; and the creation or choice of His instrument of redemption today is His, not ours. What we dare not do is to put ourselves out of court for His use by offering our '-ism' as an unchangeable and fixed thing. To do that would be an idolatrous act, for it would set the authority of our traditions side by side with God, who through His Holy Spirit, is calling us to "His work, His strange work", in this second half of the twentieth century. That would be indeed to head straight for the ecclesiological bog, the morass and slumdom of sectarianism, for we should be cut off from the one people of God that really matters —the people of God that is obedient to His demand for rebirth. Genuine catholicity is primarily not a matter of nice agreement in creed, but of true response to God's gracious and unfailing will for the redemption of the world.

The essential choice for Congregationalism today is as to whether, trusting to organization, individualistic evangelism, emphasis on tradition and the like, it becomes a dead-end sect, which may continue indeed but in fact heads straight for a cul-de-sac, or whether, going back to its origins in a far profounder sense, it will do what it did three hundred years ago—drink a cup which seems to have poison in it, and live as a creative and truly catholic form of churchmanship, both saying and living out the saving word of God to this generation. To the authorities of both Church and State in the Elizabethan and Stuart periods, freedom seemed a poison which would infallibly destroy both. Under the guidance and the coercion of the Holy Spirit Congregationalism drank that cup of freedom and shewed that freedom, so far from being a poison to either, was necessary to the true life of both. Can Congregationalism today, under the guidance of that same Spirit, drink this cup in which the seeming poison of authority is mingled with its beloved freedom?

To pretend that the threat is not there is foolish, and to act as if it were not is to pull wool over our eyes. Authority will be hard put to it not to overreach itself, and it will find it difficult to withstand the temptations that always wait on the exercise of power. It may easily overplan, and cut at the roots of that exercise of responsibility in the family and local life which has been the nursing mother of freedom. Nevertheless, in our care to be frank about the dangers of authority, we dare not make bogeys of them. We have to do with the threats to freedom what our Lord did when He became incarnate for us men and our salvation. He took open-eyed the risk that in becoming man He would know sorrow, frustration, temptation and death, and He drank the cup to the dregs, shewing thereby that there was no poison in it of which an

honest man of faith and love need be afraid. For us, too, as for Him, there is no life from God through us for the world except we go down to the gates of death. New life for Congregationalism begins there, and it begins nowhere else. Here, too, to seek to save our life is to lose it; to be willing to lose it is to find it. The courage to drink the cup is the first condition of survival as a true people of God. The new redemptive task asks for nothing less than a new Congregationalism.

Yet no outline of the pattern of the new Congregationalism can be given, and no one can foretell, as indeed no one has ever been able to foretell, what the pattern of the new redemptive people of God will be like. Luther himself was obviously uneasy about the development of the Reformation under Calvin at Geneva, and the Presbyterians of the Stuart period held up their hands in horror at the seeming anarchy of the Independents, both Congregational and Baptist. There are, and there can be, no blue prints of the shape of things to come; they remain hidden in the wisdom of God, and the more closely we organize our denominational life at the moment, the less likely we are to be free to respond to the guidance of the Spirit. Nevertheless there are some basic conditions of that rebirth which are plain for all to see, and so are at least some practical actions which flow from them.

For one thing it is clear that Congregationalism must think out afresh the true relations between authority and freedom, and here it is important that we do not see one in terms of the other. Freedom seen from the point of view of authority is one thing, and authority seen from that point of view is another; what we have to do is to discover their true relationship as revealed to us in the history of the people of God in both Testaments and in the history of the Church. That discovery will be the work both of theologians and of the practical experience of the churches themselves. It is a problem of Biblical and historical scholarship in part, but it is far more, for the authority we seek *in* Congregationalism is determined by the end which that authority is designed to serve, and that is nothing less than the present authority of the Spirit *over* the Church. All our authorities within the fellowship derive from that primary authority.

There can be, therefore, no full answer to this problem of authority apart from the acceptance of the authority of the Holy Spirit. In theory, of course, that is the position we hold, but the realities, as everyone knows, are vastly different. In theory we believe our Congregational churches were called into being by the Holy Spirit; by that same Spirit individuals were called into membership with it and by the Spirit our Church Meetings were to become the organ of our obedience to the Spirit. He would

be a bold man who would declare that these convictions are the stuff and substance of the life of our churches today. The Evangelical Revival has left its mark on us; membership in our churches is often a matter of personal liking for the minister or the social life of the church, and our Church Meetings are often little more than analogues of any democratically governed body. Worst of all, we have often individualized our conception of the Holy Spirit, and our main thought of Him is not the New Testament understanding of Him as the guide of the Church, but as the inspirer, guide and comforter of the life of the individual. We shall not see the problem of authority and freedom aright, and therefore shall not find any true solution of it until we accept, as we do not today except in name, the unquestioned authority of the Spirit over the Church, and go on to ask, not as an academic question but as one which is vital for the Church; "What authority must we have in the Church that we who are fellowships in freedom may obey the Holy Spirit?"

There will be no profit in forthwith introducing into our church-life forms of authority with which we are already familiar, that is, the authority of bishops. Our authority must grow out of our freedom in fellowship and not be imposed upon it. It is as we wrestle with that problem that we shall find the answer to the most practical and exacting of all problems in Congregationalism—the problem of discerning when it is the Holy Spirit who is speaking. There is good Apostolic warrant for declaring that neither persuasiveness of speech nor plain common-sense—as it seems—can guarantee that it is in fact the word of the Spirit which is being uttered.

If the whole question of the fellowship of the Church itself is here passed by almost without comment, it is because there is a growing sense that our church fellowships do not yet match up to the evangelical conception of fellowship. They ought to be fellowships of forgiven men willing to forgive each other; in them men who have received the supreme token of God's love toward themselves pledge themselves to give that same token of love one towards another. And that applies not only within the local church, it applies no less in the relationships between the churches themselves. There is good Biblical warrant for the older and truer meaning of "Independency", the Independency that looks to neither State nor any secular authority for either legitimization or support; there is none for the modern version of Independency as the independence of one church in isolation from all others. Congregationalism has to learn a new depth of fellowship both within the local churches themselves and between them.

The last main spiritual condition of revival is that Congrega-

tionalism must ask whether its doctrine of the Church as "gathered" really expresses the full truth about the Church. That it is one part of the truth the whole of the New Testament bears witness. At the level of faith, the Church is, and probably in history must always be, a "gathered" Church. It lives by other lights and in the strength of other powers than the world knows, and in that sense there must always be a gulf between the Church and the world. But is that the whole truth about the Church? Is it the truth about the Incarnation? If God Himself accepted the fact that the world could not be saved through the prophetic word spoken *to* it, but only by the word spoken in and through a life lived in love *in* it, and which manifested its love not only in the mighty word but in the potent deed of love, can the Church accomplish its task of redemption at less cost?

There may be, and there are, good reasons why Protestantism focused all its thought upon faith, but none the less Paul Tillich's judgment that the Protestant Churches thereby condemned themselves to forgetfulness of the claims of love as well as of faith, and by so much distorted the gospel of the Incarnation, remains true. Congregationalism has to learn afresh what it means not only to be "gathered" out of the world in faith, but to be wholly one with the world in love; to quote Tillich again, it has to learn to be part of the community and realize that the whole life of the community in which it is set is its concern. And that means far more than caring for the folk who are in need; it means trying to think, and above all to feel, with the community in its search for the true way of community life.

From these general spiritual considerations one or two practical things follow. The first is that whether we Congregationalists need a Structure and Administration Committee or not, we need even more some instrument which will attempt to see the task of Congregationalism today in the light of redemptive history. We have been officially encouraged during the last few years to look at Congregationalism in the light of its tradition, of the World Council of Churches, of the Bible, and of its relationships with the State, but we have never seriously attempted to set Congregationalism in the light of God's own dealings with His people in history. Hence, we have never measured our situation and its perils and promise in depth, and the result is that we are seeking to heal the wounds of the world too lightly.

Secondly, since the life of Congregationalism grows from its grass roots in the local churches upwards, we need deliberately to stimulate the life of the local churches, not in a three or a five-year campaign, but as a permanent mission in the life of the churches. It is the deep conviction of the present writer that there are in our

counties untapped reservoirs of spiritual experience, competence, insight and desire which ought to be used for this task and regarded as the main instruments for its accomplishment.

Finally, the Assembly of the Union has an all-important part to play in the needed renewal of the life of the Spirit in Congregationalism, but it is doubtful how far the Assembly as at present constituted can perform that task. Part of the problem is its constitution and, not to put too fine a point upon it, the presence in the Assembly of many delegates who are often unaware of the deeper issues at stake in any discussion and are left to make what are essentially snap judgments on speeches that are made. The Assembly at present is far too big and far too uninformed a gathering to be regarded as adequate for real discussion, much less a true discernment of the mind of the Spirit. Nor can the Assembly so function without a radical change in what may be called the direction of its attention. Far too much time is taken up with the backward look on what has been done, on reports and the like, far too little on trying to discern our task now and in the immediate future. The Assembly cannot function as the instrument of the Spirit unless it honestly comes to grips, as it has not done for a very long time, with its place in the counsel of God for the contemporary world.

No changes in the constitution itself, however, nor any re-direction of its main interest can be really effective unless there is a radical change in the platform and programme of the Assembly itself. That the platform and programme are almost invariably interesting, even thrilling, is a matter of common agreement, but that does not mean that the Assembly can therefore be assured that in listening, and not sharing actively, the whole word of the Spirit is being uttered. At present when time for serious discussion is already far too limited, there are three speeches mostly of an hour's duration, on which no comment is made or invited. There is no ecclesiastical gathering in England today in which, to quote the words of one of the appointed leaders of the Union, "so much is said by so few to so many". It is not too much to say that in practice the Assembly works on the theory of the plenary inspiration of individuals, and shows an unhealthy neglect of the maxim that "no scripture is of private interpretation". It is probably right that we should listen to the Chairman's Address as the private counsel of a beloved servant of the churches, but if we take either Scripture or our belief in the guidance of the Spirit seriously, surely no other speech should be so long as to prevent the judgment of the Assembly being expressed adequately. The rebirth of the Assembly is an all-important necessity for the rebirth of English Congregationalism.

The bearing of what has here been written upon the local and world-wide witness of Congregationalism is obvious. The evangelism of a Church which thinks of itself solely in terms of its separation from the community at the level of faith is one thing; the evangelism of a church which knows that it is part of the community and endures the tensions of the modern community in its own life is a different thing. The former is doomed from the start to relative sterility; the latter, speaking to a public need out of both faith and love, might well win that public response which is a genuine and lasting religious revival. More, it might end what looks like the impasse reached in the talks between the London Missionary Society and the Union. It is hard to see what real adjustment there can be between a missionary society pledged to individualistic evangelism and a Union which regards itself as trustee for a form of church-life eternally valid, fixed and unchangeable; the situation would be radically changed if we had talks between a missionary society feeling its way to a new sense of the importance of the Church, and a Union which knew that it was trustee for a Congregationalism that was itself being reborn.

* * *

In some New York newspapers there has recently been complaint about bad spelling, presumably among journalists, compositors and proof-readers, and many suggestions and some recommendations have been made. This business of good or bad spelling is curious. In our own family, for example, two members are quite reliable and two are much less so, without anything very obvious to account for the differences. Manuscripts that we see are often surprising. There is a list of ten words, which it is said, have never been correctly spelt at the first attempt. The best effort we have known was of a friend who did, in fact, write them all down correctly, but had second thoughts about one, and altered it wrongly. Here is the list:—Inoculate, innuendo, embarrass, rarefy, harass, vilify, supersede, picnicking, plaguy, dessicate.

J. M. P.

THE JERUSALEM BIBLE

By Sir Leon Simon, C.B.

The opening of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, in 1925, was followed a few years later by the establishment of a University Press, which now bears the name of the first President of the University, the late Dr. J. L. Magnes, in commemoration of the great part he played in its foundation and development. It was from the first a cherished ideal of Dr. Magnes that the University Press should produce a new edition of the Hebrew Bible for use by Jews throughout the world. Paradoxical thought it may be, the Jews of the western world have for many decades past been dependent on Christian missionary organizations for their printed texts of the Scriptures. The text most commonly in use by them was prepared by the Jewish scholar, M. H. Letteris, for the British and Foreign Bible Society; and the same organization later published the more scholarly recension of a Jewish convert to Christianity, Christian David Ginzburg. Dr. Magnes thought that one of the first and most important tasks of the Hebrew University Press should be to make available a Hebrew Bible produced in the Holy Land by Jewish scholarship and by Jewish craftsmanship and labour. The text was to be the traditional Masoretic text, freed so far as possible from the minor errors which had crept into the versions generally in use; the Jewish tradition was to be followed, where it differed from the Christian, in the division into chapters and paragraphs; and this text was to be printed in a beautiful type specially designed and made for the purpose. Alike by its high standard of correctness and by the dignity and beauty of its external form, the Jerusalem Bible was to be symbolic of the undying reverence of the renascent Jewish people for the Book of Books.

Some years elapsed before any practical steps could be taken towards the implementation of this plan; and after a beginning had been made, a number of untoward circumstances, and the outbreak of the second world war, created such difficulties that the original conception of the Jerusalem Bible has not yet been realized in its entirety. None the less, a carefully revised Masoretic text of the complete Hebrew Bible, in a single volume, has at length issued from Jerusalem. The production has been the target of a good deal of criticism, not all of which is justified when account is taken of the object which those responsible for the enterprise had in view.

That object, as has been indicated, was not to produce a 'critical' edition of the Bible, designed for scholars and furnished with an elaborate apparatus of variant readings and conjectural emendations. There was no idea of suggesting, even in footnotes, any departure whatever from the standard text as established over a thousand years ago by the great Masoretic scholar, Aaron ben Moses ben-Asher, whose recension has long been regarded by Jews as authoritative. On the contrary, the intention was precisely to reproduce the traditional text as faithfully as possible in every minute detail. That was not so simple a matter as might be thought. The existing manuscripts of the Hebrew Bible, none of which could be said with certainty to reproduce ben-Asher's recension exactly, exhibit numerous variations, not indeed in matters that are of any importance to the ordinary reader, but in regard to such things as vowel signs, cantillation signs (accents), hyphens, and occasionally the spelling of a word. The printed texts of the Bible show similar differences, partly because different manuscripts have been followed by different editors, and partly because of inevitable errors in composition and proof-reading. Thus, unless one was prepared simply to adopt the text of one of the old manuscripts, or to follow one of the modern printed editions, say that of Letteris or of Ginzburg, it would be necessary to undertake a new recension of the Masoretic text before the Jerusalem Bible could go to press. Although the object in view was to produce a Bible for popular use and not specifically for scholars and students, nevertheless, what was projected was essentially a work of scholarship.

At an early stage the promoters of the scheme succeeded in enlisting the interest of one of the leading Jewish Biblical scholars of modern times, Professor Umberto Cassuto. Born in Florence in 1883, Cassuto became Chief Rabbi and Head of the Rabbinical College in his native city, and later Professor of Hebrew Language and Literature at its University. From 1932 onwards he occupied the Chair of Hebrew and Comparative Semitic Philology at the University of Rome, and in 1939 he joined the Hebrew University of Jerusalem as Professor of the Bible. In his earlier years his main interests were in Hebrew literature and Jewish history, particularly the history of the Jews in Italy; but later he turned more and more to Biblical studies. Apart from numerous contributions to encyclopædias in English, Italian, German and Hebrew, he was the author of a work on the composition of the Pentateuch, in which he subjected the documentary hypothesis to a critical examination; and he did important work on the Ugaritic inscriptions, the discovery of which some twenty years ago revealed to scholars a previously unknown ancient Semitic language. At the time of his death, in December, 1951, he was engaged on a large-scale Hebrew

commentary on the Bible and was editing a Hebrew Biblical Encyclopædia. A scholar of unimpeachable orthodoxy and essentially conservative outlook, Cassuto was yet fully abreast of his age, with its more radical approach to Biblical problems, and he was able to meet the 'higher' critics on their own ground. His rare combination of a reverent conservatism with a mind of scientific temper and encyclopædic knowledge marked him out as peculiarly fitted to undertake the task of producing a Masoretic text of the Bible that should be as free from error as was humanly possible.

It was not until Cassuto's transfer to Jerusalem, in 1939, that he was able to set to work in earnest. Thereafter he gave a great deal of time to the task, studying and collating a number of MSS., which he chose—out of the seventy or more which had been used by Ginzburg—as likely to be of most use for his purpose. He visited Aleppo, in Syria, where there was an ancient MS. currently believed to have been written by ben-Asher's own hand. This MS. was jealously guarded by the authorities of the Synagogue in which it was deposited, and had apparently never before been used by any Biblical scholar. Professor Cassuto was not allowed to photograph the MS. but was given access to it, and his examination convinced him that it was not in fact ben-Asher's own copy, and that it had no special value for the establishment of the correct Masoretic text. (The MS. is understood to have been destroyed during the disturbances which took place in Aleppo some years after Cassuto's visit.) The MSS. on which he principally relied were that of Cairo for the Prophetic books, and that of Leningrad for the remainder of the Bible. He did not, however, follow either of these MSS. slavishly, but departed from them in minor details where this seemed to him desirable in the interests of consistency or of conformity with accepted practice. It should be added that he was assisted in his work by his brother-in-law and lifelong collaborator, Professor A. S. Artom, another Jewish scholar of Italian origin who had settled in Jerusalem.

While the recension of the Bible text was in progress, the technical side of the undertaking also received attention. As the first step, a dignified and attractive Hebrew type, based on ancient models, was designed by a distinguished typographic artist of Jerusalem. The next step was to get the type cut, but it was not until 1949 that the matrices were produced by the Lanston Monotype Company of the U.S.A. Meanwhile an arrangement had been made with the American Jewish Publication Society of Philadelphia to set the type by monotype machine, and send the plates to Jerusalem, where the actual work of printing was to be carried out. Difficulties, however, arose and the arrangement with the

Jewish Publication Society was terminated by mutual consent. Early in 1950 a new arrangement was entered into under which the setting of the type as well as the printing would be done in Israel.

This new arrangement was dogged by ill-fortune from the outset; and no progress having been made for some eighteen months, Professor Cassuto suggested that the idea of using the special type should be abandoned for the time being, and that the numerous corrections which he had made should be carried by hand into an existing printed text, from which plates could then be made by photographic process for the printing of the new Bible. As the most suitable edition for the purpose he chose the Ginzburg text printed at Leipzig in 1926.

Unfortunately, Professor Cassuto died suddenly almost as soon as his plan had been approved by the Magnes Press, and before its practical execution could even commence. It was decided, however, to carry out the plan as expeditiously as possible. Professor Artom, whom long association with Cassuto had familiarized with his ideas and methods, undertook to complete the work and to see it through the press. The task of carrying Cassuto's alterations into the Ginzburg text by hand was entrusted to a group of experts at the Bezalel School of Arts and Crafts in Jerusalem, and they performed it with such skill as to leave scarcely a visible trace of their operations in the Cassuto Bible as actually printed. They had not only to make something like twenty thousand alterations, mostly of a very minute character—involving, for example, the moving of a vowel sign or cantillation sign a tiny fraction of a centimetre to right or left—but also to remove the elaborate *apparatus criticus* which occupies an appreciable part of each page in the Ginzburg text, and to fill the gaps thus created by transferring the requisite number of lines from one page to another. Their work completed, the invisibly altered pages of Ginzburg were photographed, plates were made from the photographed pages, and from these the actual printing was done—not, as it happens, in Jerusalem, but in Tel Aviv. The Bible, containing a prefatory note explaining briefly how it had been produced, appeared in May, 1953, complete in one volume of 1,337 pages, in an edition of ten thousand copies. A second impression has since appeared.

The method by which this Bible has been produced has given rise to misunderstanding and some unjustified criticism. Obviously, any page of the Cassuto Bible looks at first sight exactly like the corresponding page of the Ginzburg Bible; and not only that, but the ordinary reader might well read page after page without realizing that there was any difference between the two texts. The ordinary

reader is not interested in the precise position of a vowel sign or a cantillation sign, so long as it is placed over or under the consonant to which it belongs; it does not matter to him whether a stroke indicating a subsidiary accent on a certain syllable appears or does not appear; and even a variation in spelling, which may make no difference whatever to the sense or even to the pronunciation of the word concerned, may not arrest his attention. Hence it has been asserted that the Cassuto Bible is merely a photographic copy of the Ginzburg Bible, but nothing could be further from the truth. There are, as has been said above, thousands of small differences between the Cassuto and the Ginzburg texts.

This does not mean, of course, that the Cassuto Bible is not open to criticism. In spite of all the pains taken to secure complete accuracy, it is not entirely free from mistakes. Some of the printing errors in the Ginzburg text have been reproduced without correction; other errors have been introduced in the process of alteration of the Ginzburg text and have escaped notice in proof-reading. The number of such mistakes, however, is believed not to be considerable, and the Cassuto Bible can fairly claim a high degree of accuracy. A more serious line of criticism is that directed to the principles on which Cassuto worked. Why did he insert a hyphen in this place, and omit one in that? Why did he favour here and there a spelling not adopted by Ginzburg or Letteris and the MSS. on which they relied? Bible scholars are entitled to ask these and similar questions. There is no doubt that Cassuto would have had his answers, for he approached his task in a spirit of reverence and with a high sense of responsibility, and certainly he would not depart from the accepted reading even in the smallest detail without what seemed to him a satisfactory reason.

Whatever its merits and defects, the Jerusalem Bible that appeared last April is regarded by its publishers as fulfilling a useful purpose, for Jews in particular, though not as the final stage in the publication of the Masoretic text as revised by the late Professor Cassuto. It is still the intention of the Magnes Press to publish that text in the specially designed type, with the type-setting and printing all carried out in the Holy City, and in accord with the Jewish tradition as regards paragraphing and division into chapters, so soon as circumstances permit.

REVIEWS

The reviews are in four divisions:

Theology and relevant studies: works of scholarship ranging from dogmatic theology and church history to psychology and cosmology.

Religion, life and work: books concerned with the daily application of religion and its popular exposition.

Miscellanea, a limited selection from current general literature.

Periodical publications.

THEOLOGY
AND RELEVANT STUDIES

The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel. By C. H. Dodd. C.U.P. 478 pp. 42s.

In this book Professor Dodd offers us the result of years of research on the Fourth Gospel. It will be indispensable to students of that Gospel for years to come, and is probably the greatest work on it produced in this century. Even for those who have no Greek a careful reading of this book will bring its reward in deeper understanding of the Johannine teaching.

The arrangement is threefold. First come six chapters descriptive of the Jewish and Hellenistic thought-background, which contributed something to the Gospel in language and ideas, and which the Gospel in turn sought to influence. The long chapter on the Hermetic Literature is especially welcome because it is the best exposition we have in English and the need has long been felt since Dodd himself whetted our appetites with the second half of *The Bible and the Greeks* (1935). The Johannine author's acquaintance with Rabbinic Judaism is allowed, but his distinctive ideas are shown not to be markedly influenced by it. He was more indebted to Hellenistic Judaism, as represented by Philo. He also has something in common with Gnosticism interpreted as belief in salvation by *gnosis;* but his exposition of what the *gnosis* is, and what union with God is, sharply differentiates him even from the near-Christian Gnostic Valentinus. Finally, in this first section of the book, Mandaism is put in its proper place after the extravagant claims for its relevance to the Fourth Gospel made by Bultmann, following Lidzbarski and Reitzenstein.

Dodd admits Hellenistic influence on the Fourth Gospel more frankly than most English scholars: "The Son of Man in the Fourth Gospel has more affinity with the Anthropos of *Poimandres* than with the Son of Man of Jewish Apocalyptic" (p. 44). But he has not gone to the extreme with Reitzenstein, for he firmly underlines the differentia of Christianity, which this Gospel conserves, as against Hellenistic mysticism: "The current conceptions of the higher religion of Hellenism have been taken up but entirely transformed" (p. 212). For all his freedom to adopt current phraseology and to recast the traditional language of the Church, the Johannine author has not compromised the three distinctive features of Christian piety: that it is corporate, not individualistic; that it is ethical; and that it is historically mediated.

The second section is devoted to an examination of the leading ideas of the Gospel, eternal life, truth, etc., with reference to their thought-background and also to the dominant conception of the author and its presentation in his new Christian book. Here, particularly in the chapter on the

Son of Man, we find Dodd breaking new ground in a subject where criticism had seemed to be hedged in with question marks. We are then ready for the third section which is the examination of the book itself, analyzed as (a) Proem (ch. 1); (b) Book of Signs, in seven episodes (ii. 1-xii. 36) plus Epilogue (xii, 37-50); (c) Book of Passion, including Farewell Discourses. "The Book of Signs is so constructed that each episode contains in itself the whole theme of the Gospel: Christ manifested, crucified, risen, exalted, communicating eternal life to men" (p. 386). But the signs look forward to a culminating event whose reality on both the temporal and eternal plane vindicates the truth of them all. This is the Passion or supreme "hour". "The Passion of the Lord is the final and all-inclusive *semeion*" (p. 439). This third section is the climax of the book with its patient explication of the Johannine method of thought and conception of the unique contribution wrought by Christ for us men and for our salvation. It is definitely interpretation; theories of date and authorship have to await another volume. The distinctiveness of John within the New Testament is emphasized. The question of the value of the gospel purely as history is discussed in an appendix, which admits that "the speeches cannot be regarded as historical"; but something greater than history is here. For in the body of the book Dodd has claimed front-rank significance for Johannine thought in relation to the whole problem of existence. "A Christian philosophy starting from the Johannine doctrine of Jesus as Son of Man should be able to escape the impasse into which all ancient thought fell, and to give an account of personality in God and in ourselves" . . . . "The gospel is a record of a life which expresses the eternal thought of God, the meaning of the universe" (pp. 249, 284). Dodd is resolutely against theories of displacements, and prefers to explain the difficulties of the text as we have it without resort to such hypotheses.

E. C. Blackman.

The Old Testament: A Conspectus. By T. H. Robinson. 168 pp. Duckworth. 8s. 6d.

In this small book Dr. Robinson has reduced Old Testament Introduction to its smallest compass, and has done it competently. It has meant the presentation of a broad picture rather than a detailed analysis, which has been accomplished by omitting discussion of divergent views and quotation of references and authorities. It is thus a book for the general reader rather than for the expert. The lay-out of the book follows that of the larger Introductions, and the author has not missed out anything of significance. Where there are important differences among scholars, he gives his own point of view, and indicates the others, but in the space at his disposal he could not give all the variations and discuss them in detail. The section on the Pentateuch gives a competent analysis of the documents, with an indication of how they have been combined into the present books. The passage explaining the meaning of "covenant" (chap. III) is very suggestive, and other able portions of the book are the explanation of the method of the historians in Kings (chap. IX), the growth of the prophetic books in their present form (chap. X), and the summary of the development of thought in Job (chap. XVII). The chapters on the Megilloth and Ezra-Nehemiah-Chronicles are rather brief and scrappy. There are a number of minor misprints, all quite obvious, and a confusion of animals and places on p. 52.

A. Morton Price.

A Theology of Salvation. By Ulrich E. Simon. 266 pp. S.P.C.K. 25s.

This is a commentary on Isaiah 40-55. The author supplies his own translation and follows this with his commentary, notes on the Hebrew

Text being printed at the end of the book. The aim of the commentary is "to explain the text, to recover lost shades of meaning, to bring to life the background, to establish a clear link with dogma, to plead with the reader and to exhort him to a personal and lasting decision". The author has greater success with the matters at the beginning of his aim than with those at the end. But the book has many fine insights and will be stimulating to the preacher. It is an ambitious attempt to explicate the theology of Isaiah in the light of Christian faith, and is fully relevant to the modern interest in Biblical theology.

The defects are of a minor nature. The translation of ch. 54, v. 11 "to *shepherd* thy stones in dark cement" is nearly nonsense. A plain verb like "lay" or "set" is adequate. The comment on ch. 48, v. 13 seems to confuse 'Amar and Qara', for the "calling" of creation into existence is not the same kind of "calling" as when God "bids his loved One to obey". The phrase "Word of God" occurs twelve times in the Introduction with a confusing oscillation of meaning. Similarly, the terms "type" and "typology" demand clearer definition. "Bousset" on p. 129 should be "Bossuet" and Robinson should be joined to the name Oesterley. Misprints occur on pp. 74, 104, 170 and 192. JAMES WOOD.

An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament. By A. H. McNEILE. Second Edition revised by C. S. C. Williams. Clarendon Press. 486 pp. 35s.

Mr. Williams has earned the gratitude of English New Testament students by bringing out this revision of McNeile. The first edition appeared in 1928, and took the place of Moffatt, whose third and last edition was in 1918. This new work is worthy of its forerunners, and will serve for a generation as the main English book on the subject. Some pages make hard reading, but that is forgivable in a work of reference. The lucidity of the students' manual by Clogg could hardly be expected here, nor could the freshness and independence of judgment of the recent introductions to the New Testament by Heard and Sparks. A notable feature of the first edition was the large proportion of space devoted to Canon and Textual Criticism; this is retained, and the revision in this section, following the line of Mr. Williams's own research, is particularly masterly. Among new material we note a chapter on Form Criticism. This had not been fully examined by English scholars in 1928, but we are now provided with a compact account of it with trenchant criticism. We miss a reference to Donovan's view of the meaning of *logia* and Manson's refutation of it, and Brandon's theory that Matthew originated in Alexandria might have had an honourable mention; but on the whole Mr. Williams seems to have missed nothing pertinent in recent literature. He has discharged a necessary task with impressive thoroughness. E. C. BLACKMAN.

Communion with God in the New Testament. By A. RAYMOND GEORGE. 274 pp. Epworth Press. 25s.

The Hope of Jesus: a study in moral eschatology. By RODERICK DUNKERLEY. 228 pp. Longmans. 15s.

The first of these books, which is by the Tutor in theology at Wesley College, Headingley, is a capable and lucid account of the expressions for Communion with God used in the New Testament. It is a model of accurate scholarship, and the conclusions which it reaches are, on the whole, moderate and reasonable. 'Mysticism' in the sense of absorption in or union with God is not found in the New Testament; it alternates

between the more intimate piety of communion and the prophetic type, which stresses the separation between man and God. Mr. George dissents from the stress laid by the Bishop of Oxford on the *vision* of God, and he holds firmly, though irenically, to a Protestant position on issues of Catholic-Protestant controversy.

Mr. George's careful scholarship makes his detailed examination of scriptural passages well worth study; but the book raises two issues of method on which he has not necessarily made the right choice. How does the theologian deal with the question of critical scholarship? If the answer is, as here, that he treats them at full technical length, the tendency will be to give a limited and prosaic theological discussion. And how does the theologian deal with a theme which could cover the whole range of Christian thinking but which also could be limited to one technical aspect? If the treatment is limited to the technical aspect, as here, it is apt to give the impression of remoteness from living reality. At times, indeed, the author tends to treat theological formulae as absolving him from penetrating to the reality behind. But the book is a valuable preparation for a full theological study of the subject, and will be of great service in removing errors and misconceptions.

Dr. Dunkerley claims that his book is the logical outcome of C. J. Cadoux's book *The Historic Mission of Jesus*. No one can ignore Cadoux's massive scholarship and indefatigable pertinacity and his emphasis on the political aspects of the ministry of Jesus contains a permanently valuable truth. But the emphasis on the moral transformation of social life, while it is one aspect of the Kingdom of God, does not explain all the mysterious language of the New Testament, nor does it fully express the fact that the Kingdom is the Kingdom of God. *The Hope of Jesus*, if too simple to account for all the facts, will help many to see the Gospels as relevant to the desire of men for a better world, and it is eminently readable.

H. Cunliffe-Jones.

Origen: Contra Celsum. Translated by Henry Chadwick. 531 pp. C.U.P. 60s.

Towards the end of the second century Celsus produced an informed and skilful attack on Christianity. When, many years later, that attack was brought to the attention of Origen, he undertook the writing of a massive reply. Attack and reply seem surprisingly modern, because in fact they are concerned with abiding fundamentals. Celsus questioned the nativity, nature and methods of Christ, pointed out the familiar difficulties in the Bible, and sneered at the humble place of Christians in the social order. Origen replied point by point, producing what is in many ways still a model of apologetic. The Dean of Queens' College, Cambridge, has given us what will probably long remain the standard English translation of the *Contra Celsum*. There is an excellent introduction, a reliable translation, and brief but sufficient annotation. The translation is in places a little free, but its accuracy is nowhere in question. Doubtful points receive proper attention and reference to the various authorities. A. R. Vine.

The Council of Chalcedon. By R. V. Sellers. 361 pp. S.P.C.K. 37s. 6d.

In his accepted limits of space Professor Sellers could hardly have dealt more competently with the background, history and significance of the Council of Chalcedon. He traces the theological controversies which led up to that Council, and shows how the famous Definition took account of the Christological insights of Alexandria, Antioch and Rome. The book is well documented, and is thoroughly reliable as a work of historical

theology. Dr. Sellers is concerned to be factual rather than speculative, and does little by way of relating the Definition to modern categories of thought, though agreeing with Dr. W. R. Matthews "that the orthodox doctrine is not an interesting survival of a phase of the past history of thought but a truth which can be stated in terms of contemporary modes of understanding" (p. 350). He provides a very valuable footnote (p. 120) on the question "in two natures" or "out of two natures". The note on the philosophical terms (p. 138) is not quite so clear, especially as to the vital distinction between *ousia* and *phusis*. But Dr. Sellers has accomplished a fine piece of work, for which all who are concerned for the defence of orthodox Christology will be grateful. A. R. Vine.

His Appearing and His Kingdom. By T. F. Glasson. 206 pp. Epworth. 16s.

Principalities and Powers. By Gordon Rupp. 112 pp. Epworth. 7s. 6d.

Dr. Glasson aroused much discussion some years ago by his book on the Second Advent, in which he examined the New Testament teaching on this perplexing matter. His views have not proved by any means universally acceptable, since most scholars believe that the note of a second coming cannot be so radically removed from the New Testament as Dr Glasson seemed to think. In this sequel, Dr. Glasson traces the Advent belief through the centuries. The book divides into two parts, the first about the appearing of Christ and the second about His Kingdom. Dr. Glasson's attitude may be summed up by saying that he believes that the process of spiritualization needs to be consistently carried through. The concrete images of the Scriptures themselves and of many believers in the course of history have time and again had to be modified, he points out, and yet there still remains the spiritual principle for which they stood, namely that the judge of all the earth will do right and that we must all face our accountability to him. I cannot think that Dr. Glasson has given us any more than an understanding of history and that therefore he has really failed to advance to a true eschatology. His conclusions will explain the gradual growth of the triumphs of Christ through the ups and downs of history, but he is unable, so far as I can see, to give any content to the New Testament expectation that at sometime this whole terrestrial order will come to an end.

Mr. Rupp in a smaller volume has given us his B.B.C. talks. It is not so much a study of what principalities and powers are, but rather a study of the age-long conflict between good and evil. He rightly starts from the present malaise of society, where even Christians seem to be uncertain not only about what they ought to do, but even about the outcome of the struggle in which they are involved. He claims that our Christian religion should give us an unconquerable optimism that in the power of God we can be sure of victory. The weapons the Christian has are three—the proclomation of the Gospel, the life of the society of the Church and the battle for the ethical standards of Christian faith in secular society.

John Marsh.

Return to Christianity. By Nels F. S. Ferre. 92 pp. S.C.M. 5s.

The Retreat from Christianity. By J. V. L. Casserley. 178 pp. Longmans. 12s. 6d.

These two books, with apparently contradictory titles, are concerned to do different tasks.

Dr. Ferré has written a stimulating essay, in which the central marks of his thinking are put in clear form. The book is small, but has an

importance far beyond its size, since it embodies a coherent statement of Dr. Ferré's attempt to present a metaphysic of Christianity in terms of *Agape* or Love.

Mr. Casserley has printed his Maurice Lectures for 1951 and has tried to analyse the reasons for the retreat from Christianity in the modern world. There are, in his view, two avenues of retreat, into irreligion and into religion. The book has a great deal of useful criticism of the rationalist and atheistic alternatives to religion, but an unfortunate prejudice mars a good deal of his judgment about religion. To a Free Church reader, it would seem that Orthodox Dissent is, in Mr. Casserley's view, a much more serious and dangerous enemy than communism or atheism. But when due allowance is made for that, the book remains a useful analysis.

JOHN MARSH.

The Recovery of Belief. By C. E. M. JOAD. 250 pp. Faber. 15s.

Christian Belief Today. By J. W. C. WAND, W. R. MATTHEWS, V. A. DEMANT and LINDSAY DEWAR. 224 pp. Mowbrays. 15s.

Dr. Joad's pilgrimage was a very interesting one and he gives us in this book his last testament, setting out the reasons why he came from unbelief not only to an intellectual acceptance of Christian theories but, as he puts it, to an obedience. The chief merit of the book is that it has no easy recourse to mysticisms, but seeks rather to argue the case intellectually throughout. He shirks no difficulties, but deals honestly with the scientific view of the universe, the problem of evil, pantheism and immortality. After a rigorous intellectual discipline, he concludes that the only basis for an intellectual understanding of the world is a God who is both transcendent and immanent. There is a final chapter on the Church of England which has repercussions outside that particular communion. Dr. Joad thinks that the hostility against the Church in various quarters is due to two causes. The first is the Church's attitude to war (he would himself take a pacifist position) and the second is the uncertainty of what the Church believes. He would have the Church say very clearly precisely what it still holds of the Bible's history and geography. But it is clear from this chapter that what did more for Dr. Joad than anything else is the life and worship of an Anglican church in an English village.

In the composite volume *Christian Belief To-day* we have lectures delivered in Westminster Abbey, St. Paul's Cathedral and St. Martins-in-the Field by four distinguished Anglicans. They might be said to offer to the intelligent layman the sort of statement of Christian belief that Dr. Joad desired. The Bishop of London talks about the scheme of Salvation, the Dean of St. Paul's writes about problems of Christian belief (Providence, progress and catastrophe, freedom, responsibility and suffering), Dr. Demant writes of the social order and the nature of man himself, while Mr. Lindsay Dewar writes about human relationships, with a valuable chapter on the sexes.

JOHN MARSH.

Christianity in an Age of Science. By C. A. COULSON. 53 pp. O.U.P. 5s.

In this series of Riddell Memorial Lectures Professor Coulson examines the possibility, in a scientific age, of holding the Christian faith with intellectual integrity. Convincingly he demonstrates the intimacy with which Nature and Man are joined, so that science and religion cannot be wholly separated. Against two relationships in which they have been falsely held (in complete apartness as though each belonged to a separate world, and in contiguity as though at the limit of scientific understanding lay the religious frontier), he argues that religion and science are basically

one. In fact, a man's science and his knowledge of the saving power of God in Christ flow from one source and are seen as different aspects of one reality, God. CONRAD BONIFAZI.

The Ethics of Aristotle. Translated by J. A. K. THOMSON. 289 pp. Allen & Unwin. 18s.

Professor Thomson provides something more than just another translation of this famous work. He holds that since Aristotle's style is "so desperately concise and elliptical", any "word for word" translation must be little better than "a precision tool"; and so he argues that, if the modern English reader is ever to be interested in "perhaps the most intelligible system of morals ever constructed by an original thinker", he must be presented with Aristotle in modern dress. Accordingly, Aristotle's asides and references back and forth are relegated to footnotes, and chapter headings are introduced which describe the ground next to be covered. The result is very pleasant to read; and while there will inevitably be discussion about Professor Thomson's method as a whole and about this or that detail of translation, it may certainly be said that this will be a welcome addition to many a library. JOHN HUXTABLE.

Christendom Attacked. By CONRAD BONIFAZI. 190 pp. Rockliff. 21s.

As Jeremiah said of the baskets of figs, so we can say of books: the evil are very evil, the good very good. This is one of the latter and deserving of every commendation. It is a competent piece of work in the study of two very difficult thinkers, Kierkegaard and Nietzsche, who both violently attacked the Christianity of modern Christendom, the one from the standpoint of an extreme pro-Christian, the other from that of an extreme anti-Christian. Lest middle-of-the-road Christian thinkers begin to comfort themselves with the reflection that the truth is probably somewhere in the middle, let me say at once that here it is a question of either/or. Both prove their case that the common run of what is known in Western Christendom as organized Protestant Christianity, Church Christianity, or State Established Christianity is only a catastrophic caricature of the Christianity of Christ and the New Testament, and is wide open to the most devastating criticism. It remains therefore, at least with a few reservations, to side either with Kierkegaard or with Nietzsche, and to take to heart what they have to say. Kierkegaard and Nietzsche are both getting at the same thing from opposite standpoints. It is the recognition and working out of this which is the great merit of this book. We understand what Kierkegaard is driving at the better because of Nietzsche's rodomontade; and we see more clearly what Nietsche is buzzing about through Kierkegaard's outbursts. Both were outstanding thinkers in that they were able to free themselves from some of the commonly unquestioned assumptions of Christendom; and I am quite sure that Kierkegaard would have preferred the outright anti-Christianism of Nietzsche to the luke-warm, world-conquered, self-satisfied, pseudo-Christianity of his day 'especially in Denmark', but not entirely unknown in our country in our day. This book will take a valued place in the growing corpus of Kierkegaardian literature. There is a valuable and extensive Bibliography of books and periodicals in English, German and French and the Index is a model of its kind. H. V. MARTIN.

Recent Thought in Focus. By DONALD NICHOLL. 250 pp. Sheed and Ward. 16s.

Any man who writes a book with the title "Recent thought in Focus" will have a point of view, and this point of view will not always be shared

by his readers; but if his point of view is openly avowed, those who dissent from it may still derive much profit from his thinking. That is true of this book. The writer is a Roman Catholic and a Thomist in philosophy. He writes in a lucid and clear style. The intelligent reader will find that all barriers of technical language have been eliminated. Mr. Nicoll discusses Modern Philosophy (Marxism, Phenomenology, Existentialism, and Logical Positivism), the Natural Sciences (in particular Evolution), and Psychology. Under Existentialism there are particular studies of Kierkegaard, Heidegger and Marcel. On all these he gives a clear and definite judgment, broadly based in theistic principles and common sense, and gives an excellent guide to the untrained reader. At the same time, if one is not a Roman Catholic or a Thomist, the bias of that point of view cannot be completely eliminated, for Mr. Nicholl partly attains his brilliant clarity by his denial that modern movements have raised questions which modify the traditional Thomist answer. Though Mr. Nicholl's focus is broadly speaking of the right kind, he cannot be said to provide the final answer to all the difficulties. H. CUNLIFFE-JONES.

The Cross and the Crown. By NORMAN BEASLEY. 502 pp. Allen and Unwin. 25s.

The author is not himself a Christian Scientist but he has had access to "much material hitherto unknown". The title is based on the symbols which appear on all the authorized writings of Mary Baker Eddy; the sub-title is "The History of Christian Science". It is an account of the life and writings of Mrs. Eddy from the time of her healing in 1866 (she was born in 1821) and does not shirk the troubles in which the movement was involved, though the attitude to Mrs. Eddy is only just less than idolatory. The book has two outstanding defects. First, it fails to maintain the promise of the sub-title to tell the history of Christian Science. Instead it confines itself to a biography of the foundress and some appendices; even so it is deficient in that it relegates her three marriages to a small footnote, only takes up her life from the age of forty-five, and does not mention the date or circumstances of her death. Secondly, it fails to fulfil the blurb on the jacket that "there is not an emotional line in the book" (quoted from the *Christian Science Monitor*). It is shot through with partisanship and marred by attacks on Mrs. Eddy's enemies and on the churches. It is fascinating (and shocking) to trace the growth of bibliolatry towards *Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures* until finally it appears as the sole and infallible interpreter of the Bible and even to displace the Bible (cf. pp. 228, 253, 264, 279f., 281, 416). The reader who is not a Christian Scientist is unlikely to be impressed by the quality of inspiration in the many quotations from *Science and Health* and the *Miscellaneous Writings*, the "hymns" and orders of service and the "spiritual interpretation" of the Lord's Prayer. He could form a much more balanced judgment from H. A. L. Fisher's incisive monograph on the movement entitled *Our New Religion*. W. GORDON ROBINSON.

Mind and Life. By Sir ARTHUR TANSLEY. Allen & Unwin. 171 pp. 15s.

The author is a distinguished botanist who can set psychological theory against the whole study of "life". Here he expounds the main themes of accepted psychology as "an essay in simplification". His work is marked by sober wisdom and urbanity of style which bespeak a guide of rare quality in this indispensable field of modern knowledge. He tells the straigthforward fundamental story of how human thought and action arise from a psycho-somatic structure, sustained in dynamic equilibrium by

energies whose behaviour-pattern is reasonably well established. He goes on to fill in the detail by discussing instinct, heredity and environment; freedom of the will, which he shows is a function of the integration of the personality; purposive thought, which he evaluates in close relation to the general principle of the attainment of equilibrium; and love, whose personal significance is not destroyed by a sober analysis of its roots in biological impulse. The subject of the story remains recognisably human, man, with a conscience, and with a significant capacity for religion. In the ninth chapter he carefully sifts Freud's main proposals in order to weed out from them the weak and misleading elements which normally turn psychology into such a depressing business. Sir Arthur's picture of man is immensely stimulating to the preacher and theologian, who can comment upon it profitably and without strain. In the last three chapters he offers his own comment under the titles: "the family and the community", "the individual and the community", and "psychological reality and spiritual values". The second of these, for which the first is preparation, is a critique of socialism, with the same quality of political vision as is displayed by Lord Woolton, Sir William Lawther, and most sober-minded ministers of the Gospel. The last chapter is a quite sensitive defence of man's status as a spiritual being. The book provides an excellent education in psychological wisdom and it is a pleasure to take it in this form.

W. A. WHITEHOUSE.

Psychology for Ministers and Social Workers. By H. GUNTRIP. 356 pp. Independent Press. 12s. 6d.

Here is a book packed with interesting observations by one who was once in charge of a Church, and now devotes himself to psycho-therapy. Well received as a first edition, the second edition has been enlarged by the author. He has added to Chapter I, and gives an appendix on masturbation in which he makes clear his own thoughts on a troublesome problem. Chapter II includes a paragraph on anxiety over bereavement which is most helpful for the pastoral worker. There are two additional chapters, one on The Leader and The Group, and one on the developments in psychoanalysis since Freud's death. We are indeed indebted to Mr. Guntrip for his exposition of the psychological problems which confront both the Social Worker and the Minister; but in adding to his first edition he has tended to overload his work with material that could have served well as a basis for another volume. It is not every Minister and Social Worker who has the desire, or the background, for understanding the complicated ramifications of the Melanie Klein theory, or of Fairburn's, whom Mr. Guntrip specially favours. It would seem that the author has lost sight of the reader for whom his first edition was intended. Further, his treatment of the personality structure must raise doubt as to the efficacy of the Christian solution to personality disorders. How is correct relationship between man and God attainable if already the personality is impaired by a wrong child-parent relationship in very early life? Are bad internal relationships to be regarded as handicaps within the personality structure, and are we to cope with them as St. Paul did through the Grace of God. I hope that in his next edition Mr. Guntrip will give us a clearer exposition of how man, handicapped by the unconscious conflicts within his mind, can be a full Christian. However, the purpose of Mr. Guntrip is not only to educate his readers on the subject of human personality and human relationships, but also to stimulate their thinking along paths now being explored. This he certainly succeeds in doing. W. E. SARGENT.

The Christian Society. By STEPHEN NEILL. 334 pp. Nisbet. 17s. 6d.

In this important book Bishop Stephen Neill has not written just another work on church history, but a study of the way in which the Christian Church has contributed to the quality and the pattern of what, for want of a better word, we may call secular society. To have done this task in some 300 pages is an outstanding achievement. It is very valuable to see our own local Church problems, which press sometimes rather heavily upon us, set against this wide background of 2,000 years and of world-wide movements. We are enabled to see that the Church has had no steady growth, but a number of advances and disruptions in its relationship with society at large. Perhaps the most valuable contribution of the book lies in the field of ecumenical thinking and Bishop Neill, who is himself on the staff of the World Council of Churches, is a very fair exponent both of his own Anglican communion and of other Churches. Further, by reason of his missionary work in India and his travels for the World Council, he is not pre-occupied, as many Westerners would be, with the problems peculiar to European society. At a time when Congregationalism is concerned with the Forward Movement, it is perhaps interesting to note that Bishop Neill indicates the two factors which have given the Christian society the inner resources to survive and grow in the face of outer adversity and inner weakness. The first is that "it has never wholly lost its contact with Jesus Christ", the second is that the most effective element of stability is "the continuity of public worship". These two factors might well be taken to heart by Congregationalists in the further phases of their Forward Movement.

JOHN MARSH.

Proceedings of the Seventh International Congregational Council. Edited by RALPH CALDER. 180 pp. Independent Press. 15s.

Mr. Calder is to be congratulated on having produced so clear and excellent a record of the Seventh International Council, which was held at St. Andrews in June, 1953. Full information as to constitution, officers and business sessions are given, there is a complete list of those present, and photographs of speakers and other notabilities. But the main part of the volume comprises reports, in most cases verbatim, of the sermons and addresses delivered at the Council. These will be most valuable for record. No one who is seriously interested in International Congregationalism can do without this book.

A. R. V.

RELIGION

LIFE AND WORK

Jesus, Leader of Men. G. W. Butterworth. 177 pp. Religious Education Press. 8s. 6d.

This purports to be a "study of the claims of Jesus on man and society"; in fact it is a "life" of Jesus, written around the concept of leadership. Dr. Butterworth does not set out to give "a comprehensive account of all that Jesus has come to mean to his followers in the Christian Church"; rather, he aims to "go back to the beginning and picture what Jesus was like to the men who saw him first". Accordingly, the Synoptic Gospels are the chief sources for this "dispassionate historical account of Jesus". The result is very much what might be expected from anyone who set out from such a basis to accomplish such a task. It is taken for granted that the historical framework of the Gospels is reliable, and the whole reads like a continuous narrative, interspersed here and there with comments on the teaching of Jesus.

Within his self-inflicted limits the author succeeds moderately well; but at least two fundamental questions seem to be raised. Is it quite fair to ignore so many issues to which recent scholarship has given profound attention? Whether he agrees with them or not, Dr. Butterworth can hardly expect to get away with completely ignoring the Form-Critics, especially in a work which he himself describes as "of sound scholarship". Moreover, Dr. Butterworth assumes a valid distinction between Jesus "as they saw him" and "all that Jesus has come to mean to his followers in the Christian Church"; but that is the sort of assumption which it is so important and revealing to examine; and once more you can hardly leave it unexamined without turning a blind eye to a whole wealth of recent New Testament scholarship. It may be that Dr. Butterworth is right; but right answers are more impressive if they are preceded by the "working".

John Huxtable.

Understanding The Old Testament. J. E. Fison. 208 pp. O.U.P. 6s.

This is a book for schools; and very good it is. In a well produced volume of 208 pages the history and religion of Israel are set forth in an interesting fashion; and there is a wealth of useful maps, biblical references and suggestions for wider reading. Teachers responsible for R.I. will find this most useful; and the instruction it enables them to give will be religious, not mere information, since Canon Fison skilfully weaves the record around his sub-title, "the way of holiness": unlike many otherwise similar books, this is *heilsgeschichte*. J. H.

God's World. G. D. Yarnold. 80 pp. Religious Education Press. 3s.

Dr. Yarnold, a clergyman with sufficient scientific equipment to be senior lecturer in Physics at Nottingham University, has written a useful little book designed to suggest the Christian view of the findings of modern science; and it is done with an eye on adolescents, in whose minds this issue often looms very large. It is well done; and many workers among young people will be glad of its timely help. J. H.

The Seed and the Fruit. Leslie Hunter. 122 pp. S.C.M. 8s. 6d.

The Bishop of Sheffield has never minced words, and in this study of 'Christian morality in a time of transition' he speaks his mind with laudable forthrightness. His book is an expanded version of some lectures given at

McGill University, Montreal, together with an essay on Eternal Life, which originally appeared in *The Pilgrim*. Dr. Hunter lays the foundation of his argument in two chapters entitled "Morality and Christian Morality" and "The Morality of Grace"; after this he discusses several crucial issues, and passes to a (very thin indeed) chapter on what the Church should be doing. Nevertheless, much of this book is of great value, for Dr. Hunter combines with a well-informed mind a shrewd judgment on men and affairs; indeed, a main impression of the book is its downright common-sense. At the same time it is rather scrappy; and it might have been better if the author had treated his two fundamental chapters more fully, and used much of his other material to illustrate his themes; then the book might have seemed more solid. There is a reference to Free Church worship on p. 79 which I think is quite unfair, but it has enough truth in it to sting; so it is worth pondering.

JOHN HUXTABLE.

Mercy and Sacrifice. By NORMAN SNAITH. 126 pp. S.C.M. 7s. 6d.

The sub-title says that this is "a Study of the Book of Hosea", and so it is to some degree; but its greatest interest lies in the digressions. Dr. Snaith's theme is that "Hosea was the pioneer of a newer prophecy than he ever realized. Hosea found out that religion primarily is a matter of relationship with God" (p. 25). From this point of view he uses the book as a foundation on which to build an interesting discussion on Old Testament prophecy and prophetic thought and method; indeed in the last chapter he goes on to use it as the text for a Christian sermon on the sacrifice of Christ. The book is well written in a vigorous style.

A. MORTON PRICE.

Towards an Understanding of the Gospels, by E. Smalley (Epworth Press, 83 pp., 6s. 6d.) fulfils the promise of its title, and lay preachers and schoolteachers will find it useful. It has first a summary of background knowledge and Synoptic criticism, and then the Gospels are briefly characterized, Luke and John at rather disproportionate length. Unfortunately most of the works on which the author relies are prior to 1930.

The Disciple Who Wrote These Things, by H. E. Edwards (James Clarke, 232 pp., 12s. 6d.) is an independent study of the Fourth Gospel. Its thesis is that the Beloved Disciple outlined his memories of the ministry of Jesus to the group of Jewish Christians who fled from Jerusalem to Pella about 62 A.D.; this was taken down in shorthand by a young Christian who some 30 years later brought his notes into the form of our present Gospel. On this hypothesis the Fourth Gospel has much higher historical value than the Synoptics, since it contains many *ipsissima verba* of Jesus and even the element of interpretation is by one of the Twelve. In its final publication it was addressed to purely non-Christian circles. Canon Edwards moves away from familiar critical positions and it is entrancing to follow him; but the alternative positions he takes up are likely to prove shifting sands.

Saint Paul's Gospel, by Ronald Knox (Sheed and Ward, 103 pp., 7s. 6d.) is a model of how to popularize theology without diluting it. The crisp and vivid style and beautiful phrasing are beyond praise. The theology is sound though erring a little in the direction of Monophysitism. The ecclesiology is not so sound from the point of view of Congregationalist theory; but we note the admission that the early house-church was "a cross-section of Christendom, a little microcosm in which the Church was represented, as the sun may be reflected in a puddle"!

E. C. BLACKMAN.

The Hymns of Charles Wesley: A Study of their Structure. By R. Newton Flew. 80 pp. Epworth Press. 6s.

Methodists have much that the rest of us must envy; but nothing more eminently enviable than the delight with which they talk and write about their hymns. The rest of us talk about hymns; but they talk about 'their hymns' with pious and proprietary joy. Only Manning has done this for Congregationalists, and he owed much to the Methodist accent. Dr. Flew's book is a treasure and an example. He writes, of course, with insight. He writes as a man to whom the omission of the second verse of 'Love divine all loves excelling' is an offence, where the rest of us, Baptists apart, have accepted it as a convention. He writes especially of the literary form and structure of Wesley's hymns, lovingly exposing for us the machinery of his inspiration as well as its content. For the hymnologist, and for the man who seeks refreshment of his devotion, this is an important and rewarding essay. But is it because Methodists so venerate and rejoice in Wesley that so little vital hymnody has come from Methodists since 1791? Is the canon closed? That is the question to which one day we should like to hear a Methodist answer. Erik Routley.

The Public Worship of God. By Henry Sloane Coffin. 208 pp. Independent Press. 12s. 6d.

This most useful "Source Book for Leaders of Services" was reviewed in these columns when the first English edition appeared in 1950. We are grateful to the Independent Press for making it available again, even though the price has now had to be increased to 12s. 6d.

Dr. Coffin writes as an American Presbyterian, but all ministers who are responsible for the conduct of public worship in Reformed and non-liturgical churches will find much here that is of great value. Chapter V on the composition of public prayers deserves special attention from all who are committed to this most exacting duty. His emphasis on the importance of comprehensiveness, orderliness, concreteness, objectivity, freshness in thought and language, variety and brevity in public prayer is to be much commended. Christian worship is offered to God and throughout the service the note of praise and adoration should be sounded. At the same time, worship must be interesting and helpful to all who take part in it. The useful bibliography which is added as an appendix inevitably omits mention of a number of valuable books which have appeared since Dr. Coffin wrote in 1946. James M. Todd.

Helping the Lay Preacher. By John Wilding. 96 pp. Independent Press. 6s.

Mr. Wilding writes simply, interestingly and helpfully out of his own experience as a minister about the task of preaching and the conduct of services. The greater part of these "Simple Notes for the Beginner" is devoted to the preparation and delivery of sermons. Lay preachers, and ministers too, will find much practical help in this book. If they do not follow all Mr. Wilding's methods they will be grateful for many points that he raises. More help might well have been given on the subject of public prayer, which most lay preachers probably find the most difficult part of the service. The final chapter, on "The Preacher's Reading", has surprising omissions; and details such as price and publisher might usefully have been added to recommended books. James M. Todd.

George Whitefield, The Awakener. By Albert D. Belden. 302 pp. Rockliff. 30s.

This book described as "A Modern Study of the Evangelical Revival", first appeared in 1930. Text and footnotes have in many, though not in

all, cases been brought up to date and numerous excellent illustrations have been added. It might have been made clearer, perhaps by the inclusion of an additional preface, that this is a second and revised edition.

Dr. Belden has done well to remind us how great a part George Whitefield played in the evangelical revival of the eighteenth century. He claims that "whilst Wesley was the steady light of the revival, Whitefield was the raging flame" and that without his pioneer achievement "there might well have been no Evangelical Revival, no Methodist Church, no mighty social emancipation such as resulted therefrom". Here is the story of Whitefield's life and work, of the ceaseless journeys he undertook and the influence which his remarkable preaching exerted.

In the last part of the book Dr. Belden advocates a liberal theology which is somewhat loosely attached to George Whitefield.

JAMES M. TODD.

The Conquest of Devil's Island. CHARLES PEAN. 188 pp. Parrish. 10s. 6d.

Charles Péan, a French Salvation Army Officer, was given the task of going out to the *Bagne,* the Penal Settlement of French Guiana, to live and work among the convicts. In this book he describes his experiences there and the steps which led to the final abolition of the Settlement. It is the story of a Christian task completed by the power of Christ.

JAMES M. TODD.

The Silver Chalice. By THOMAS B. COSTAIN. 527 pp. Hodder and Stoughton. 15s.

By his art the novelist takes his readers as fellow-travellers with a certain Basil, a sculptor of Antioch, on his journeys between Jerusalem and Rome in the first century of our era. Basil is making a frame worthy to hold the silver cup from which Jesus drank at the Last Supper, and in his travels meets many notable characters of the New Testament. The story moves forward upon a background of Jewish nationalism, the credulity of the world before the arts of Simon Magus, the corruption of Nero's Court and the expansion underground of the young Church. Its colourful description both of life and the variety of persons who move into its focus impart to the account a fascination reminiscent of the power of the finest religious novels.

CONRAD BONIFAZI.

God's Planning for Mankind, by W. Eric Hodgson (63 pp., Independent Press, 4s.), received its stimulus and subject matter from a diagram illustrating the "Plan of Salvation". In seven chapters Mr. Hodgson enlarges upon chosen passages of Scripture dealing with the character and revelation of God, man's revolt against Him, and God's way of healing this broken relationship. The author's homely, direct style indicates how the word was first spoken; it is to be hoped that through the printed page many other people will share its inspiration.

The Gospels Today, by L. A. Garrard (30 pp., Lindsey Press, 1s. 6d.) is one of a series of booklets in which Unitarians state their faith. The editor of "The Hibbert Journal" has contributed this number and in it summarises briefly the results of scholarship over the last 35 years in throwing light upon the Gospels, the process which resulted in their present form, the propaganda purpose within their origins, and their reliability as history. Those who will advance from this simple but first-rate account to a fuller study are directed in a bibliography to the more exhaustive works of pioneers in the field of the New Testament.

The Bible and Preaching, by H. H. Farmer (24 pp., Berean Press,

Birmingham, 12, 2s.), deals with the preacher's task of confronting his contemporaries with the living truth of God through writings from a remote world. Dr. Farmer describes the decisive relation of the Bible to Christianity's "central and controlling essence", belief in the Incarnation. Christ's advent is both unique in history and continuous with it, and this "inhistorisation" links God with Israel, with the Church, and with the Bible which sets forth this saving history. In this organic unity the Bible becomes contemporary. The lecture abounds in substance and vitality and deserves careful study by every preacher.

The Great Argument, by Lynn Harold Hough (95 pp., Epworth, 7s. 6d.) presents a collection of sermons, all of recent construction, whose aim is to express "the renaissance of hope in a decadent world". The writer attempts to pass between the shallow optimism of a previous generation and that uncritical pessimism which marks our own day. Few travellers have made this journey, so that within the limits of fourteen Sermons its contours remain uncharted. The author, however, envisages the way, and for inner sustenance to traverse it looks to the grace of Christ.

Objective and Method in Christian Expansion, by Alexander McLeish (37 pp., World Dominion Press, 1s. or 50 cents.) is directed to all who recognize the Christian Missionary obligation. These challenging and informed lectures were delivered recently at Princeton Theological Seminary. The lecturer compares modern missionary methods (referring particularly to practice in India) with the direct concern of the apostles for the founding and welfare of churches, and their subsequent 'spontaneous expansion'. Rapidly changing conditions, into which the older patterns of service no longer fit, demand revolutionary adjustments of thought and approach, looking back for their interest and emphasis to the practice of the first apostles.

CONRAD BONIFAZI.

It would be interesting to know how many will pick up *To Introduce the Family,* edited by the Rev. Ralph Calder (Independent Press, 8s. 6d.), and will be astonished to discover that it is not another book for the newly married but a survey of worldwide Congregationalism. Here are excellent surveys of Congregationalism in the British Isles, America and the Commonwealth, masterly summaries of the work of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions and of the London Missionary Society, and an account of small groups in Europe and S. America with Congregational affinities. This was a work well worth doing, and with contributors like John Marsh, Douglas Horton, Mary Walker and Maxwell Janes, and an editor like Ralph Calder, it has been excellently done.

All who are giving anxious thought to the future of Congregationalism should pay attention to *Congregationalism-Plus,* by Norman Goodall (Independent Press, 3s. 6d.). It is a first-hand account (Dr. Goodall being recorder and commentator) of how Congregationalism, nurtured under settled and familiar conditions in Britain, works out in a new environment and when brought into new relationships with other forms of churchmanship. What, for instance, becomes of the Church Meeting or of the lay ministry? Is full recognition given to women in the life of the Church? What use is made of a confession of faith? It needs to be said by way of caution that to recognize an embryonic or a modified Congregationalism in such circumstances is a totally different matter from suggesting that developed Congregationalism might go back to beggarly elements which it has long forsaken. What we are caused to look upon is, sometimes, Congregationalism—*Minus*! Some mission churches may well be Presbyterian in government. But may not a day come when the clash of principle

between Presbyterian and Congregationalist will be revealed? And may not the same be true of those who have been taken into an episcopal system? It is too early to say that Congregationalism is a principle which can live and thrive under a variety of forms. Some forms put the very existence of our principles in peril.

About a year ago the General Purposes Committee of the Congregational Union asked eleven men and women to report on *The Marriage of Divorced Persons*. The Report under that title is now issued by the Independent Press, price 8d. This whole subject is one treated with the utmost seriousness by our ministers and is widely discussed among them. The Report offers nothing new, but it may comfort ministers by confirming their judgments and may well enlighten the rank and file of our membership. It is a pity to see the howler "registry office" creep into even a semi-official document.

God's Kingdom Come, by Arthur Griffiths (Simpkin Marshall, 10s. 6d.) gives in ten chapters spiritualist messages recorded by the author. Lemuria, Atlantis, Persia, Red Indians, Reincarnation—they are all here. And an apologetic reviewer is forced to declare that he could not endure to the end.

The Preacher's Handbook (*No.* 3), edited by Greville P. Lewis for the Epworth Press, 8s. 6d., is intended primarily for Methodists. It will be found helpful to any preacher. Packed into the compass of a single volume are stimulating essays on aspects of the preacher's art, studies on topics suggested by the Christian Year and two potted commentaries.

There has been for many years, and there still is, much discussion about "the Church". What do the findings mean in relation to the local fellowship? How shall we express our faith about "the Church" in ordering the life of what we sometimes call "our Church"? To this very relevant question Paul Rowntree Clifford has addressed himself in *The Mission of the Local Church* (S.C.M., 7s. 6d.). Three chapters of close theological thinking are followed by four chapters on the life of the local congregation, everywhere enriched by Mr. Rowntree's practical experience. Ministers especially will find this a book well worth reading.

Boreham fans, and they are many, will be glad to know that a dozen of his Christmas "pieces" have been collected together to form *My Christmas Book,* by F. W. Boreham (Epworth Press, 5s.).

An amazingly cheap and valuable help to Bible-study is to be found in *Now Let it Work,* by T. C. Baird (Epworth Press, paper, 1s. 6d.). This is a paraphrase and running commentary on the Epistle of St. James. After each of the five sections into which the work is divided there are at least half a dozen lively questions relating the message to this age. But is not the Jacobean authorship accepted too lightly and used to explain too much?

A book that is moving in its very simplicity is *Christ With the C.I.D.,* by Ex-Chief-Inspector Reginald Morrish (Epworth Press, paper, 4s.). Here is a man who has a professional knowledge of sin. He knows that in very truth the Devil is ever seeking whom he may devour. He declares that none is exempt from temptation, no profession, no age. But beyond all that he knows a power which can keep and a power which can save, the power of Christ. This book is worthy to be set beside *God in the Slums* or *Finding Men for Christ.*

Marionettes and Rod Puppets, by H. W. Whanslaw (Religious Education Press, paper, 2s.), is a sequel to the same author's "Bible Puppetry". Between them they form a fascinating introduction to a form of entertainment which can be enlisted into the service of evangelism.

Dr. Ralph W. Sockman is described as America's leading religious broadcaster. He has also apparently been often in demand as a special

lecturer to University students. In *How To Believe* (Epworth Press, 10s. 6d.), he sums up the content of a reasonable faith under the several clauses of the Apostles' Creed. The book will be found to be different not only in its spelling and phraseology but in a more subtle sense. Its climate of religious thinking differs from ours. This is what many were saying here 25 years ago. But humbly and gratefully we may claim to have moved on since then. To read this book is rather like coming across a snap of oneself while at college.

Broadway Book No. 6 is entitled *The Waiting Isle,* by G. E. Burton (Livingstone Press, 2s. 6d.). It gives a succinct account of the present situation in Madagascar and of the place of the Christian Church there. Mr. Burton writes of what he knows and loves, and his enthusiasm is infectious. There are many problems and there is also the Church raised up by years of devoted missionary enterprise. It will play a major part in solving the problems and in shaping the future of this fascinating island.

Fishers of Men, by Canon Peter Green (Mowbray, 5s.), is written by an Anglican for Anglicans. But anyone with a concern for evangelism is well advised to read it. He will find himself pricked in his conscience and wondering what the Free Churches have to offer that is at all comparable with the Parochial Missions of Anglicanism.

Issued in its 7th (Revised) Edition, *The Child In the Midst,* by E. H. Hayes (R.E.P., 5s.), is clearly the classical exposition of modern Sunday School method. During its 40 years of life it has helped to work wonders. Now that it is brought right up-to-date its ministry to teachers and scholars will have a new lease of life.

Healing—Spiritual and Other Means, by W. L. Northridge (Epworth Press, paper, 1s. 3d.), is a little pamphlet full of knowledge and sense on a topic of great contemporary interest.

For the third time in recent months we welcome the appearance in print of a "Lift Up Your Hearts" series by John Huxtable, *Father, Forgive Them* (Independent Press, paper, 1s.).

One World, One Faith, is a reprint of a series of Bible Study Notes by N. A. Turner-Smith. They appeared originally in the I.B.R.A. Notes for 1953 and are now re-issued as a Broadway Special (Livingstone Press, 1s. 6d.). The purpose of God for the people of God is traced through the Old and New Testaments alike with special emphasis on the scope of that purpose.

Minds In Movement is commended as an introduction to the vast subject of relations between an aroused East and a turbulent West. It is a group report issued by the Friends (Gollancz, paper, 2s. 6d.). One is impressed by its fairness, particularly in its discussion of the present situation in China.

JOHN WILDING.

The Graphic Bible (Independent Press, 12s. 6d.), by Lewis Browne, has reached its second English impression. It is an American work, the first English impression having appeared in 1950. It is a book of 139 large pages, and consists of picture maps and charts illustrating the whole Bible history, together with admirably written explanatory narrative. It is a real help to the understanding of the Bible, and would prove of service to lay preachers and Sunday School teachers. It is to be commended for including a clear sketch of the period between the Old and New Testaments, including the heroic story of the Maccabees.

Christian People's Worship is valuable in itself, and interesting as showing how methods of Christian worship can be adapted for the use of younger churches. It was compiled, primarily for the use of the Church in Bechu-

analand, by the Rev. A. Sandilands, M.B.E., a missionary of the London Missionary Society. The original is in Tswana, but there is also an English version, obtainable from the Livingstone Press, 42 Broadway, Westminster, S.W.1, at 7s. 6d. The book, of 191 pages, contains plenty of material for ordinary and special services, and owes much to a variety of sources. It will interest those who like to study liturgies and orders, and ministers may be glad to use or adapt much of the material supplied.

The Pope's Men is a twenty-four page essay by Dr. Nathaniel Micklem (Independent Press, 1s.), in which the Roman Catholic position is analysed with gentle but penetrating thoroughness. The authoritarianism, the intolerance, the syncretism of the Roman Church must not be overlooked, nor must we underestimate her "menace" as a "politico-ecclesiastical engine" and as "an elaborately organized international pressure-group".

The *Epworth Greeting Calendar* for 1954 (Epworth Press, 2s. 7½d.) is a picture calendar containing twelve well-chosen English scenes and, for each month, a verse, a quotation and a prayer selected by Dr. Leslie Church. A. R. V.

World Christian Handbook, 1952. Edited by E. J. Bingle and Kenneth G. Grubb. 389 pp. World Dominion Press. 15s.

This is the latest edition of a very useful work of reference first published in 1949. The long survey of the affairs of Churches and Missions throughout the world is replaced in this edition by a series of eight articles dealing with special subjects of general interest, including 'The Ecumenical Movement since Amsterdam' by Kenneth G. Grubb, 'The Roman Catholic Church' by Père Christopher J. Dumont, 'A Review of Religion in the U.S.S.R.' by Dr. Paul B. Anderson, and two articles on the Orthodox Church in Europe and the East by the Rev. H. M. Waddams and Canon Edward Every respectively. The greater part of the Handbook is, of course, given up to statistical tables covering the whole world and every branch of the Christian Church, arranged by countries and continents with the appropriate world summaries. Tables are given for the world's Bible Societies, International and Ecumenical organizations. A third section consists of a Directory of Churches, Missions and ecumenical organizations with their executive officers and their addresses. The Index occupies 37 pages. The World Council of Churches and the International Missionary Council are associated with the production, for which, however, the Editors and publishers alone accept responsibility. J. M. Phillips.

JUST RECEIVED

The *Concise Guides* to the Graded Sunday School Lessons for 1954 have been improved even beyond their traditionally high standard. They are edited by Mr. E. H. Hayes, published by the Religious Education Press, and priced at 5s. for Beginners and 6s. each for Primary, Junior, Senior and Young People. Sets of weekly *Papers* are also provided for the Beginners, Primary and Junior grades. These cost 2s. per set for the year, and will prove well worth their price in holding the scholars' interest.

The *Congregational Pocket Diary* for 1954 (Independent Press, 5s.) is invaluable for ministers and others who need reasonable space for their daily engagements and appreciate a line-a-day section for the following year. It is of handy size, 4 in. x 3 in., bound in morocco-grained plexide, contains useful denominational and other information, and is obtainable in blue, green or red. And there is a slide-in pencil for the forgetful!

MISCELLANEA

Science and the Social Order. By BERNARD BARBER. 288 pp. Allen and Unwin. 20s.

Two commonly held beliefs are that science is autonomous, and that man's control over the physical and biological universe is in the hands of natural science. With these beliefs Mr. Barber is in disagreement (p. 261). His thesis is that science is influenced by its connections with the different parts of a society. Economic and political factors influence the progress of science, but so equally do cultural values and ideas, among which, not least, is religion. Some society patterns are more compatible with the development of science than others. "Calvinist Protestantism . . . was an especially favourable version of Christian attitudes towards the world for the development of science" (p. 57). Mr. Barber lists the approval which modern liberal society places upon rationality, utilitarianism, universalism, individualism and progress, as especially conducive to the maintenance of a high level of scientific activity (pp. 62-66). This is because science is a moral enterprise: "It is not to be construed simply as a set of technical rational operations, but has to be seen also as a set of activities devoted to definite moral values and subject to clear ethical standards" (p. 84f). The four chapters (Chapters 5-8) which deal specifically with science in American society make fascinating reading, but the importance of this book lies in its setting of science in its true perspective. J. S. WRIGHT.

Man, Creator or Destroyer. By G. M. STRATTON. 170 pp. Allen and Unwin. 16s.

The Professor of Psychology in the University of California has produced a somewhat disappointing book. It sets out to examine the creative abilities of man and the conditions necessary for their full exercise. In a suggestive opening chapter the writer points out how man differs both from machines and animals, goes on to show later how his constructive powers can be turned to destructiveness, and concludes that the solution of human problems is to be found only in the creation of a true community of nations. The convinced Christian will probably feel that Dr. Stratton has oversimplified the issues by taking an insufficiently realistic view of the evil in men, and that he does not give due place to the need for religion if the community is ever to be created; indeed the suggestion seems to be contained in only one sentence, or at the most two. There is little that is new either in thought or expression, and what is said could be put in far fewer words. L. J. TIZARD.

The Refugee in the Post-War World. By JACQUES VERNANT. 827 pp. Allen and Unwin. 45s.

This massive work is the result of a study by a group of experts made at the request of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. It describes the position of refugees in 1952 and forms a sequel to Sir John Hope Simpson's survey in 1937-38. The book, which contains a bibliography and an excellent index, is divided into eight parts. Part I defines the term 'refugee', states the problems to which refugees give rise, gives some account of the international bodies concerned with these problems, and enumerates the various categories of refugees. The remaining parts analyse the refugees' situation in the countries of Europe, the Middle East, North and South America and India. Special sections are devoted to Israel,

Shanghai and Korea. Full weight is given to the contribution of the Churches to the solution of this world-wide problem, and, in spite of its severely factual and statistical character, there is much in this book to interest, shock and hearten the general reader.

Having given hospitality to, among others, 137,000 out of 280,000 Polish refugees and to 40,000 out of 207,000 German Jews, it would appear that we in Britain have played our part. But it is salutary sometimes to see ourselves as others see us. To M. Vernant and his team of expert enquirers England appears as neither green nor pleasant: it is "a land of little sunshine and much rheumatism", and "if it is true that legally, administratively and materially the refugee is as well off in Great Britain as anywhere in Europe, psychologically England at any rate is probably the most difficult of all countries in which to be a refugee". It is good to know, however, that the Yugoslavs at least have settled down happily amongst us. So happily that on one occasion miners in the Doncaster area were on strike as a protest against the alleged victimization of a Yugoslav miner, and that at one time a Yugoslav was the darts champion of Staffordshire!

P. A. SPALDING.

The Treatment of the Young Delinquent. By J. ARTHUR HOYLES. 274 pp. Epworth. 18s. 6d.

Many people will suspect that a book on juvenile delinquency written by a parson will be ill-informed or sentimental or both. Mr. Hoyles' work is neither. It is a full-length survey of the subject of which the author has made an intensive study since 1939. He has read widely and observed closely, and the result is a well documented and authoritative piece of work.

A great number of books have been written on juvenile delinquency within recent years, but none, so far as I know, has been more comprehensive, and certainly none has more directly related the subject to Christian theology and ethics. It contains a great deal of history, a description of the procedure of the juvenile court and of modern methods of dealing with young delinquents. Although the book is not over-burdened with statistics many valuable sets of figures are given. Mr. Hoyles examines the influence of heredity and environment and comes to the conclusion that "Neither the biological nor the sociological interpretation of juvenile delinquency has, of itself, proved convincing and satisfying to the Christian investigator". In every case it is necessary to understand what led the boy or girl into crime. The writer argues powerfully for the modern psychological approach, especially in a most useful chapter on "Hidden Motives". He discusses competently the various theories of punishment and lays squarely upon the shoulders of society the task of redemption, believing firmly in the power of the Christian Gospel to effect the re-birth of the most hardened criminal, whatever his age.

L. J. TIZARD.

Language in Thought and Action. By S. I. HAYAKAWA. 307 pp. Allen and Unwin. 18s.

This work began as a revision of the author's *Language in Action*, published in 1941, but has become a new book on the 'science of semantics', which is defined by the author as "the study of human interaction through the mechanics of linguistic communication." No one can deny that the problems of communication through speech and writing at the present time demand the most urgent and skilful examination. In the days when Western civilization was a unity certain moral values were generally accepted, if not always carried into action, and the problems of communication were largely mechanical. But in the world as it is, there are few

universally accepted values. One result is that the same words may be used, and readily translated from one language to another, yet the connotations may be so different that communication has become even more difficult. Consider, for example, the meanings in different parts of Europe, to say nothing of the rest of the world, of such words as 'democracy' and 'freedom' and even 'peace'! Even within a recognizable circle of discourse, such as the English-speaking peoples, the spread of literacy brings its own semantic problems, as when words used for information or for persuasion carry different connotations. Equally, the same things may be described by different words in order to produce different effects, as when one speaks of 'poor relief' or 'social insurance' or 'national assistance'. These are simple examples of what 'semantics' deals with. The author divides his book into two parts, the first dealing with 'The Functions of Language' and the second with 'Language and Thought'. Though much of the book is plain common-sense dressed up in scientific garb, it is not the less useful on that account. It can be heartily recommended to all writers and speakers, and will be especially helpful to beginners in arousing a sense of responsibility in their use of language and in the cultivation of a higher degree of exactness in saying what they mean and meaning what they say—and in listening to what is said. The reader of this book will also gain much curious knowledge of American ways of speech. The examples and exercises provided at the end of each chapter are both useful and highly entertaining, but when we think of the devices and successes of modern propaganda, we sometimes laugh that we may not weep. J. M. PHILLIPS.

In 1887, the year before his final collapse, John Ruskin met a young art student, Kathleen Olander, in the National Gallery. Attracted both by her talent as an artist and by her personal charm, he became her teacher and began a correspondence which culminated ten months later in a proposal of marriage. In *The Gulf of Years* (Allen and Unwin, 9s. 6d.) these letters, deliberately suppressed by Ruskin's literary executor, are printed with a commentary by their recipient, now Mrs. Kathleen Prynne, and a preface by Mr. Rayner Unwin. They form a new chapter, brief, lyrical and tragic, in the biography of one of the most eminent Victorians.

Little Dorrit (O.U.P., 12s. 6d.) is a recent addition to the 'New Oxford Illustrated Dickens'. First issued in book form in 1857, this, though less often read today than *Bleak House* or *Our Mutual Friend,* is one of the three great novels of Dickens's last period. In his brilliant Introduction Mr. Lionel Trilling claims that since *Little Dorrit* "is about society in its very essence, it will not fail to be thought of as speaking with a peculiar and passionate intimacy to our own time". The forty plates, which have been remade from the original drawings by 'Phiz', alone make this edition a bargain at its price.

A recent addition to the Home University Library is Mr. W. P. Baker's *The English Village* (O.U.P., 6s.). Since there are approximately 10,000 villages in England, it is impossible in a book of 220 small pages to do more than treat in broadest outline of the character, population and activities of the typical village, and of the institutions, from the County Council to the Women's Institute, which govern the village or help to make it a community. There is an excellent chapter on the Church, which considers the place of religion in the lives of all the villagers, "whether Church, or Chapel, or 'just Wireless'." Mr. Baker is more concerned with the present and the future than with the past, and his book will appeal rather to those who actually live in a village, or intend to do so, than to seekers after the historic and the picturesque. P. A. SPALDING.

PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS

Hibbert Journal (Oct.) includes 'Michael Servetus' by Dr. H. J. McLachlan: 'The Comparative Study of Religions' (II) by Rev. D. W. Gundry: 'Judaism and the Future' by Dr. Israel Mattuck (a liberal view): 'Judaism's Prospects' by Emile Marmorstein (a traditionalist view): 'Existentialism and Christian Theology' by Dr. E. L. Allen: 'Towards a New Modernism' by Christopher Baynes: 'The Churches and Science' by Denis A. Routh: '*Theologia Diaboli*' by Dr. F. H. Heineman: 'The Problem of Church and State' by Dr. A. D. Belden.

International Review of Missions (Oct.) includes 'The Vedanta Philosophy and the Message of Christ' by Dr. Carl Keller: 'Mission and Eschatology' (concluded) by Prof. W. Manson: 'The Decline and Survival of Christianity in Asia' (concluded) by Rev. Francis S. Gray: 'Missionary Endeavour in Pondoland' by G. F. A. Baer: 'Christian Missions and Leprosy' by A. Donald Miller: 'Leprosy—A New Era' by Dr. R. G. Cochrane: 'The Literacy Campaign in Haiti' by H. O. McConnell: 'Getting Books to the People of India' by F. D. P. Penning.

The London Quarterly and Holborn Review (Oct.) under its new editor, Dr. J. Alan Kay, includes 'Methodism and the Catholic Revival' by Rev. T. J. Foinette: 'John Wesley and Ireland' (I) by Rev. J. C. Bowmer: 'Our Protestant Heritage' by H. R. Chillingworth: 'The Laureate of Empire' by W. S. Handley Jones: 'Collected Poems by Dylan Thomas' by Dr. T. B. Shepherd.

Expository Times (Aug.) has 'L. S. Thornton's *The Incarnate Lord*' by Rev. G. V. Jones: 'The Gospel of Mark made more vivid' by C. S. Emden; 'The Little Apocalypse Theory' by Rev. C. A. Beasley-Murray: (Sept.) 'Jesus as Intercessor' by Prof. John Mauchline: 'Marcel on Infant Baptism' by Prof. H. H. Rowley: 'The Kingdom of God in our Day' by Prin. Victor Murray. (Oct.) 'The Problems of Biblical Exposition' by Prin. Cunliffe-Jones: 'Preaching in Eclipse' by Rev. J. N. Alexander: 'The Priority of Mark' by Prof. H. G. Wood.

The Church Quarterly Review (July-Sept.) includes 'Boniface—Founder of Spiritual Unity in the West' by Prof. K. D. Schmidt: 'The Training of the Clergy' by Prof. Leonard Hodgson: 'The Fourth Gospel'—a review article on C. H. Dodd's recent *Interpretation*, by Dr. S. H. Hooke: 'The Church and Marriage' by Arthur T. Macmillan.

The Modern Churchman (Sept.) prints the addresses delivered at the annual conference of Modern Churchmen. 'Permanent Values of Religious Liberalism' by Sir Henry Self: 'Liberal Christianity in an established Church' by the Bishop of Manchester: 'The Continuing Task of Liberal Theology' by Canon Bezant: 'Liberal Protestantism' by the Dean of St. Pauls: 'Liberal Catholicism' by Rev. D. J. W. Bradley: 'English Liberal Noncomformity' by Prof. E. L. Allen: 'Progressive Judaism' by Dr. J. W. Parkes: 'Continental Theology' by Prof. Marcel Simon: 'Freedom in Religion' (psychological) by Dr. R. S. Lee: 'The Moral Foundations of Liberalism' by Rev. H. C. Snape: 'The Future of Religion' by Dr. Gilbert Murray.

Evangelical Quarterly (Oct.) has 'Written that ye may believe' by Harold St. John: 'The Means of Grace in Puritan Theology' by O. R. Johnston: 'The Modern Eschatological Debate' (concluded) by Prof. T. F. Torrance: 'Repentance' by Rev. James Graham.

Harvard Theological Review (No. 2) has 'Greek Proverbs in the Gospel' by Rev. Arnold T. Ehrhardt: 'Michael viii Palaeologus and the Union of Lyons' by Deno Geanakoplos: 'Marriage Contracts in Ancient Egypt' by Dr. Jacob Rabinowitz. (No. 3) ' "Knowledge" in the Dead Sea Scrolls' by Dr. W. D. Davies: 'Sacrifice and Worship in the Dead Sea Scrolls' by Dr. J. M. Baumgarten: 'Representative Christology in New Testament' by Dr. E. L. Allen: 'St. John Chrysostom's Parentage and Education' by A. H. M. Jones.

Theology Today (July) includes 'Mysticism and the Christian Experience' by Prof. Otto Piper: 'The Jesus of History and the Christian Faith' by Rev. R. C. Johnson: 'Appraisal of Theories of the Atonement' by Canon F. W. Dillistone: 'A Liturgical and Ecumenical Problem' by Prof. Roger Hazelton: 'Charles Williams' by Prof. R. AcAfee Brown: 'Theological Convictions and Democracy' by Prof. Winthrop Hudson.

Yale Review (Autumn) includes 'A Letter to Americans' by René Sedillót: 'Europe after Stalin' by Prof. Mario Einaudi: 'Advertising—the Institution of Abundance' by Prof. David M. Potter: 'Science and the Irresponsible Imagination' by Prof. Norman Nelson: 'Propaganda and the Cold War' by Prof. George Catlin.

Huntington Library Quarterly (Aug.) has 'Shakespeare's Use of War and Peace' by Prof. A. Jorgensen: 'The Royalists in Exile during the Puritan Revolution' by Prof. P. H. Hardacre: 'A Message to Fort Henry in the French and Indian War' by Prof. Wilbur Jacobs: 'Virgins, Villains and Varmints' by W. H. Hutchinson.

J. M. P.